SHOUT
SHARE
IT

S. 2702.
4.

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

PURCHASED
19 APR 1950

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

VOLUME 4

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

LONDON:
Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth
International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948.
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the
International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
at the Publications Office of the Trust
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1950

(*All rights reserved*)

Printed in Great Britain
by Metchim & Son, Ltd.,
at their Press at 8, Princes St.,
Westminster, London, S.W.1.

THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature on behalf

of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

have great pleasure

in

expressing their grateful thanks

to the

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

— U.N.E.S.C.O. —

for the financial assistance

afforded

towards the cost of producing

the present volume

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)
President : Dr. James L. Peters (U.S.A.)
Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)
Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology)

Dr. James L. Peters (U.S.A.) (*President*) (1st January 1944)
Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)
Professor Lodovico di Caporiacco (Italy) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (28th March 1944)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)
Dr. William Thomas Calman (United Kingdom) (1st January 1947)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) 1st January 1947)
Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom) (*Honorary Life President*) (27th July 1948)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)

C. The staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming
Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The staff of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Honorary Registrar : Mr. A. S. Pankhurst
Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1
Offices of the Trust : 41 Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

DATE OF ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE AMENDMENTS TO THE "RÈGLES" DECIDED UPON BY THE THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY, PARIS, JULY 1948

Note by the President of the Section on Nomenclature of the Congress

At their Final Plenary Session held on Tuesday, 27th July 1948, the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology approved the proposals submitted by the Section on Nomenclature regarding the amendment of the *Règles*, the date on which those amendments should come into force and the action which zoologists should be recommended to take pending the entry into force of those amendments.

2. The decisions so taken by the Congress included a decision that the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature should be requested to publish as soon as possible in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* the Official Record of the Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature during its Session of Meetings held in Paris in July 1948 and that the President of the Section on Nomenclature should prefix thereto a short note explaining the arrangements that were being made for the early publication of the *Règles* as revised by the Paris Congress.

3. In accordance with the foregoing decision of the International Congress of Zoology, notice is hereby given as follows :—

(1) The decisions taken by the Congress in relation to the amendment of the *Règles* are being remitted forthwith to jurists for the preparation of a revised draft to give effect to those decisions. That draft, after being received from the jurists, will be communicated (*a*) to all Members and Alternate Members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature who attended the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology and (*b*) to those Members of the Commission who did not attend that Congress, for the purpose of enabling them to satisfy themselves that the draft prepared by the jurists gives full effect in every respect to the decisions taken by the Congress and also that the phraseology employed in the draft in relation to technical matters is of a kind that will the most readily be understood by zoologists. Any comments which Members and Alternate Commissioners may offer on the foregoing matters within a period of three calendar months of the despatch to them of the draft prepared by the jurists will be referred, for determination, to the Editorial Committee of Three established for this purpose by the Congress. Immediately decisions have been taken by the Committee of Three on any matters so raised, the revised text of the *Règles*, so determined, will be communicated to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature for immediate publication.

(2) The revised text of the *Règles* will formally enter into force immediately upon being published in the manner specified above, the existing text of the *Règles* being simultaneously repealed.

(3) Zoologists are advised, during the period between the publication by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature of the Official Record of the Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July 1948 and the formal entry into force of the text of the *Règles*, as revised by the Congress, to guide themselves in their work by reference to the decisions in regard thereto recorded in the Official Record of the Proceedings of the Commission, and thus to proceed as though the revised *Règles* were already published and in force. Every decision relating to the *Règles* adopted by the Congress, on the recommendation of the Section on Nomenclature, had previously been the subject of a recommendation by the Commission, the Official Record of the Proceedings of which thus contain a full record of every decision taken by the Congress in this matter.

BY ORDER OF THE THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL
CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY, PARIS, JULY, 1948

FRANCIS HEMMING

President of the Section on Nomenclature,
Thirteenth International Congress of
Zoology, Paris, July 1948.

7th January 1950.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners in attendance during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (*Acting President*)

Senor E. Beltrán (Mexico) *vice* Senor Angel Cabrera (Argentina)

Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)

Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)

Professor Lodovico di Caporiacco (Italy)

Dr. Edward Hindle (United Kingdom) *vice* President Karl Jordon (United Kingdom)

Professor Arturo Ricardo Jorge (Portugal) *vice* Senhor A. do Amaral (Brazil)

Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.) *vice* Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.)

Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) *vice* Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada)

Professor Kamel Mansour (Egypt) *vice* Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary)

Professor Z. P. Metcalf (U.S.A.) *vice* Vice-President James L. Peters (U.S.A.)

Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom) *vice* Dr. W. T. Calman (United Kingdom)

Professor P. Rode (France)

Professor R. Spärck (Denmark) *vice* Dr. Th. Mortensen (Denmark)

Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium) *vice* Professor R. Richter (Germany)

Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.) *vice* Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.)

Secretariat in Paris

Secretary to the Commission : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Acting Documents Officer : Miss J. H. Shorey

Attendance at Meetings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by Members of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, other than Members and Alternate Members of the Commission

M. J. Aubert (Switzerland)
M. Belloc (France)
M. H. Berthet (France)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
M. André Chavan (France)
Professor Ernest N. Cory (U.S.A.)
M. Georges Deflandre (France)
Mme. Marthe Deflandre-Rigaud (France)
Mr. J. Delacour (U.S.A.)
Mr. Cyril F. dos Passos (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (U.S.A.)
Professor E. Fischer-Piette (France)
Professor A. Ghigi (Italy)
M. H. Gisin (Switzerland)
Dr. H. A. F. Gohar (Egypt)
Dr. Isabel Gordon (United Kingdom)
Professor E. Raymond Hall (U.S.A.)
Professor W. P. Hayes (U.S.A.)
M. Denis Jacques (France)
Professor R. Jeannel (France)
Dr. P. Jespersen (Denmark)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Dr. H. H. J. Nesbitt (Canada)
Dr. S. di Toledo Piza (Brazil)
Mr. C. D. Radford (United Kingdom)
M. G. Ranson (France)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)
M. J. Segal (U.S.S.R.)
Dr. Ethelwynn Trewavas (United Kingdom)
Signor Antonio Valle (Italy)
Mr. R. Winckworth (United Kingdom)

CLASS AND ORDINAL NAMES USED IN THE OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE AT ITS MEETINGS HELD IN PARIS IN JULY, 1948.

Note by the Secretary to the Commission.

The Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique do not provide rules for the nomenclature of groups above the family level. In consequence, individual workers are free not only to recognise whatever Classes and Orders appear to them to be appropriate from the taxonomic standpoint but also to apply to those categories whichever names they may choose.

2. The question whether it would be possible to stabilise the nomenclature of groups above the family level was considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at a joint meeting with the Section on Nomenclature held in Paris on Monday 26th July 1948. At this meeting, the International Commission adopted (Paris Session 13th Meeting, Conclusion 28) a resolution recommending that the Secretary to the Commission should be invited to study the foregoing question in conjunction with interested specialists, and to submit a comprehensive Report thereon for consideration by the Commission at the next (XIVth) Meeting of the Congress, with a view to the submission by the Commission of proposals for the insertion in the *Règles* of comprehensive provisions dealing with this subject. This recommendation was approved by the Section on Nomenclature (Paris Session, 5th Meeting, Conclusion 3) and (with the other recommendations, submitted by the Section on Nomenclature) by the Congress at its Plenary Session held on Tuesday, 27th July 1948.

3. While therefore an effort will be made, before the Meeting of the Commission and the Congress in Copenhagen in 1953, to prepare, for the consideration of zoologists, a scheme for the stabilising of the nomenclature of Classes, Orders and other groups above the family level, the names to be used for such groups remains at present a matter of individual choice. In these circumstances, it would be inappropriate for the International Commission itself in any given case to express a preference for any particular name. On the other hand, it is necessary for purposes of reference that an indication should be included in the Official Record of the Procedings of the Commission regarding the position in the Animal Kingdom of the various taxonomic units on the nomenclature of which decisions were taken by the Commission. Accordingly, on this occasion, as on that which arose in connection with the preparation of the Official Record of Proceedings of the Commission at its Session of Meetings held in Lisbon in 1935, the responsibility for the choice of the names used to denote Classes and Orders rests exclusively with myself as Secretary to the Commission. Thus, the use, in the Official Proceedings of the Commission in Paris, of one name in preference to another does not imply any view by the Commission as a body on the relative merits of that name in relation to some other name also in use by workers to denote the category in question.

4. The inclusion of references to the higher taxonomic categories to which a given genus or species is referable is naturally not essential to specialists who

are familiar with the relationships of the groups which form their special study, though the insertion of such references may often be a matter of convenience for ready reference, especially in the numerous cases where a worker is engaged in the study of a part only of some large group. The main object of inserting such references is of quite a different order, being to facilitate the work of editors of recording journals (such as the *Zoological Record*) and thus to ensure the inclusion, in such journals, of references to decisions taken by the International Commission in regard to particular generic and specific names. In selecting the names of higher taxonomic units to be inserted in the Official Record of Proceedings of the Commission, I have therefore set myself on the one hand to achieve a reasonable degree of uniformity in presentation and on the other hand to make use of names which are well known and will be readily understood. Accordingly, wherever there exists a substantial degree of agreement among specialists regarding the higher classification of the groups with which they are concerned (though not necessarily in regard to the names to be applied to the categories so recognised), I have inserted both the name of the Class and that of the Order to which the genus or species in question is referred. Where, however, as in many groups of Invertebrates, the present state of knowledge is insufficient to enable specialists to reach any general agreement in regard to Ordinal classification, I have cited only the name of the Class to which the genus or species concerned is considered to belong.

FRANCIS HEMMING,

Secretary to the International Commission
on Zoological Nomenclature.

Secretariat of the Commission :
28 Park Village East,
Regent's Park,
LONDON, N.W.1, England.

26th January 1950.

CERTIFICATION OF THE TEXT OF THE OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE AT ITS SESSION OF MEETINGS HELD IN PARIS IN JULY, 1948.

Note by the Secretary to the Commission.

At the Fourteenth of their Meetings held in Paris in July, 1948[1], which was held jointly with the Sixth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature gave special consideration to the arrangements which should be made for the preparation, by the Secretary, of the Minutes of the Meeting held by the Commission during that Session and for the verification, by the Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners concerned, of the text so prepared.

2. The Commission decided (Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion 65) to deal with this matter as follows : (1) in view of the inevitably great length of the Minutes of these Meetings, the draft prepared by the Secretary should be printed as soon as it had been prepared : (2) as soon as proofs had been received from the printer, a copy should be sent for comment and approval to each Commissioner and Alternate Commissioner who attended the Paris Session, air-mail being used for all destinations outside the United Kingdom ; (3) a period of one calendar month was to be reserved as the period within which comments or suggestions by the Commissioners or Alternate Commissioners should be returnable to the Secretariat of the Commission ; (4) at the conclusion of the foregoing period, the Secretary was to make any changes or corrections in the draft Minutes which might be found to be necessary in the light of the comments received from the Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners and, having done so, should forthwith transmit the text, so amended, to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature (the corporation responsible for the financial operations required by the Commission) for publication in the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature " at the earliest possible date.

3. Volume 3 of the " Bulletin " containing the text of the documents considered by the Commission in Paris is necessary for a proper understanding of the Minutes of the Meetings of the Commission, those Minutes naturally containing frequent references to the documents which had then been under consideration. Arrangements were therefore made for the supply by the printer of a sufficient number of proofs of volume 3 to enable a copy to be circulated to each Commissioner and Alternate Commissioner who had attended the Paris Session. These proofs were despatched at the end of November 1949 to all the Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners concerned, with the exception of Commissioner P. Rode (France) whose death had occurred not long after the close of the Paris Session. Copies addressed to all destinations outside the United Kingdom were despatched by airmail. The proofs of the Minutes of the Paris Meeting were received from the printer on 5th December 1949 and on the following day (6th December 1949) one copy was despatched to each of the Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners concerned, with a covering note referring to the

---

[1] See pages 642–644 of the present volume.

decisions taken in Paris and asking for a reply not later than 6th January 1950. the last day of the prescribed period that had been agreed upon. Airmail was used for all destinations outside the United Kingdom.

4. Before the end of the prescribed period, replies were received from the majority of the Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners concerned. At the end of that period, cables were despatched to those Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners from whom no replies had by that time been received. Within about a fortnight of the end of the prescribed period replies had been received from all the Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners concerned with the exception of one Alternate Commissioner whom it must be assumed was either ill or away from home at the time.

5. The communications so received from Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners raised points which called for action of two kinds : (1) the letters received contained a large number of notes on minor drafting matters, printer's errors and the like ; (2) in addition, some of the letters drew attention to certain obscurities or apparent inconsistencies in the drafting adopted for particular items in the Minutes. On the receipt of the letters concerned, all the corrections notified under (1) above were incorporated in the Minutes. As regards points arising under (2) above, letters were sent by myself as Secretary to the Commission to each of the Commissioners concerned, explaining the manner in which it was proposed to meet the points which he had raised. All the explanations so offered were accepted as satisfactory by the Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners concerned and the changes so agreed upon were thereupon incorporated in the text.

6. Subject to the comments and suggestions referred to above, each of the Commissioners from whom replies were received approved the draft Minutes as representing a true and accurate record of the proceedings of the International Commission during its Session of Meetings held in Paris in July 1948. Thus, the Minutes of the Meetings held by the International Commission in Paris in July 1948, as amended in certain respects in the manner indicated in the previous paragraph, have now been approved by the following fourteen (14) Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners out of the total of sixteen (16) Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners who were present at the Paris Session : H. Boschma (Netherlands) ; J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) ; L. di Caporiacco (Italy) ; Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) ; E. Hindle (United Kingdom) ; A. R. Jorge (Portugal) ; Harold Kirby (U.S.A.) ; Henning Lemche (Denmark) ; K. Mansour (Egypt) ; Z. P. Metcalf (U.S.A.) ; N. D. Riley (United Kingdom) ; R. Spärck (Denmark) ; V. van Straelen (Belgium) ; Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.). Of the two (2) other Commissioners who were present at the Paris Session, Commissioner Paul Rode died after the Congress and before the circulation of the draft Minutes ; while no reply has been received from Alternate Commissioner E. Beltrán (Mexico).

7. I accordingly certify that, in accordance with the procedure agreed upon in Paris, the text of the Official Record of the Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session of Meetings held in Paris in July 1948 as now published in Volume 4 of the

" Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature " has been unanimously approved and adopted by the Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners who were present at that Session as constituting a true and accurate record of the decisions taken thereat.

FRANCIS HEMMING.

Secretary to the International Commission
on Zoological Nomenclature.

Secretariat of the Commission :
28 Park Village East,
Regent's Park,
London, N.W.1, England.

1*st February* 1950.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE AT THEIR SESSION HELD IN PARIS IN JULY 1948

CONCLUSIONS of the First Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Loius-Liard on Wednesday, 21st July, 1948 at 1430 hours.

Page

1. Absence of the President and Vice-President and assumption of the Acting Presidency by the Secretary 1

2. Apologies for absence received from Commissioner Paul Rode (France) 2

3. Commissioners present at the Paris Session 2

4. Resignation of Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark) on account of ill-health 2

5. Commissioners absent from Paris and unable to attend Session thereat 3

6. Appointment of certain members of the Congress to be Alternate Members of the Commission for the duration of the Paris Session 3

7. Arrangements for meetings during the Paris Session 4

8. Second Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session : date and time appointed 5

CONCLUSIONS of the Second Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Wednesday, 21st July, 1948 at 1440 hours

1. Official languages at the Paris Session 6

2. Procedure to be followed at the Paris Session : suspension of the By-Laws and other matters 7

3. Deaths of Commissioners since 1935 8

Second Meeting (*continued*)

Page

4. Election in 1936 of Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) to be Secretary to the Commission in succession to Commissioner C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.) 9

5. Creation in 1939 of Offices of Vice-President and Assistant Secretary to the Commission and election thereto of Commissioners C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.) and James L. Peters (U.S.A.) 9

6. Constitution of the Class 1946 in place of the Class 1937 10

7. Assumption by President Jordan of extraordinary powers on behalf of the Commission during the war 1939–1945 10

8. Constitution under the "Emergency Powers Declaration, 1939" of the Classes 1949 and 1952 in place of the Classes 1940 and 1943 13

9. Constitution of the Class 1955 in place of the Class 1946 13

10. Losses in the membership of the Commission since 1935 through resignations 15

11. Election of Commissioners since 1935 15

12. Re-election of the President and the Secretary as from the beginning of 1941 16

13. Re-election of the Assistant Secretary as from the beginning of 1944 17

14. Election in 1945 of Assistant Secretary James L. Peters (U.S.A.) to be Vice-President 17

15. Establishment of the Class 1958 in place of the Class 1949 .. 17

16. German and Japanese representation on the Commission 18

17. Nomination of Members of the Class 1958 19

18. Presidency of the Commission: request by Commissioner Karl Jordan (United Kingdom) to be excused from nomination as President for a further term 19

19. Nomination of Vice-President James L. Peters (U.S.A.) to be President 22

20. Nomination of Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) to be Secretary to the Commission for a further term .. 23

Second Meeting (*continued*)

Page

21. Nomination of Commissioner Afranio do Amazal (Brazil) to be Vice-President 23

22. Abolition of the Office of Assistant Secretary as hitherto constituted, and its reconstitution as a post in the Secretariat of the Commission 24

23. Co-operation between the Commission and specialist groups : report on progress achieved since 1935 25

24. *Opinions* and *Declarations* published since the meeting of the Congress held at Lisbon in 1935 27

25. Programme of the Commission for its Paris Session 27

26. Report by the Secretary on the work of the Secretariat since the meeting of the Congress held at Lisbon in 1935 28

27. Thanks of the Commission to the Right Hon. Walter Elliot for accepting the Chairmanship of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature 31

29. Thanks of the Commission to the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 31

29. Thanks of the Commission for donations received 32

30. Thanks of the Commission to UNESCO 32

31. Preliminary report on the work of the Commission during its first and second meetings to be submitted orally to the Section on Nomenclature as soon as possible 32

32. Preliminary reports on the work of the Commission at its third and subsequent meetings to be submitted to the Section on Nomenclature as soon as practicable after the close of those meetings 34

33. Arrangements for the preparation of the Report to be submitted to the Congress 35

34. Composition of the Commission and the method of nominating its members 35

35. Place of meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session .. 36

36. Third and Fourth Meetings of the Commission during its Paris Session : dates and times appointed 36

CONCLUSIONS of the Third Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Wednesday, 21st July, 1948 at 2030 hours.

Page

1. Size of the Commission and nature of its composition 37

2. Method to be followed in the nomination and election of members of the Commission 40

3. Arrangements to be made for Commissioners periodically to submit themselves to re-election 44

4. Grant of leave of absence to, and removal of, Commissioners in certain circumstances 46

5. Reform of the rules of procedure of the Commission 49

6. Reform of the voting procedure of the Commission 50

7. Plenary Powers Resolution : proposed amendment and incorporation in the *Règles* 51

8. Date of entry into force of the reforms agreed upon in regard to the procedure of the Commission 57

9. Changes in procedure designed to accelerate the work of the Commission 57

10. Announcement to be made to the zoological public regarding the arrangements made by the Commission for speeding up its work 59

11. Revision of the By-Laws of the Commission 59

12. Fourth Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session : date and time noted 61

CONCLUSIONS of the Fourth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Thursday, 22nd July, 1948 at 0900 hours.

1. Election of Professor E. Beltrán (Mexico) to be an Alternate Member of the Commission for the duration of the Paris Session .. 62

2. Telegrams despatched by the Acting President on behalf of the Commission 63

Fourth Meeting (*continued*)

Page

3. Meaning of the expression " nomenclature binaire " as used in the *Règles* 63

4. Consolidation and amendment of the *Règles* : preliminary consideration 66

5. Status of new names published in a form or in a manner contravening Articles 14–16, 18 and 20 67

6. Article 25, Proviso (*c*) (2) : the expression " definite bibliographic reference " 68

7. Article 25, Proviso (*c*) (1) : the expression " which differentiate . . " 70

8. Article 25, Proviso (*c*) (3) : the expression " definite unambiguous designation of the type species " ; Articles 29 and 30, consequential amendments 71

9. Status of the provisions in the former *Appendice*, now a Schedule, to the *Règles* 73

10. Grammatical inconsistencies in the *Règles* 73

11. Article 31 : need for the removal of confusion between taxonomy and nomenclature and for the substitution of direct provisions for the existing provisions by reference 73

12. Substantive French text of the *Règles* : arrangements to be made for completion and promulgation.. 76

13. Article 25, Proviso (*a*) : meaning of the expression " indication " in relation to generic names 78

14. Status of names proposed for forms of less than subspecific rank : preliminary consideration 81

15. Fifth Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session : time appointed 82

CONCLUSIONS of the Fifth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Thursday, 22nd July, at 1430 hours.

1. Status of names proposed for forms of less than subspecific rank : further consideration 83

Fifth Meeting (*continued*) *Page*

2. Article 2: insertion of reference to the category "subgenus" 96

3. Articles 35 and 36 (problem of specific homonyms): preliminary consideration 97

4. Sixth Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session: time appointed 97

CONCLUSIONS of the Sixth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Thursday, 22nd July, 1948 at 1700 hours.

1. Articles 35 and 36 (problem of specific homonymy): further consideration 107

2. Need for publicity for new names and for the selections of type species of genera 125

3. Definition of the expressions "specific name" and "specific trivial name" 127

4. Definition of the expressions "subspecific name" and "subspecific trivial name" 128

5. Specific trivial names always to be published in connection with generic names 129

6. Co-ordination of the Laws of Priority and Homonymy .. 129

7. Application to generic names of the provisions in third paragraph of Article 35 relating to specific trivial names 130

8. Thanks of the Commission to Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming 131

9. Codification of the interpretations of the *Règles* given in *Opinions* rendered by the Commission: future procedure in regard to 132

10. Interpretations of provisions in the *Règles* in *Opinions* rendered by the Commission: proposals for incorporation of, in the *Règles* to be considered item by item 137

11. Article 4 and *Opinion* 141 (family names) 138

12. Article 8 and *Opinion* 183 (generic names to be published in the nominative singular) 139

Sixth Meeting (*continued*)

Page

13. Article 14, first paragraph, and *Opinion* 64 (single letters not eligible as trivial names) 140

14. Status of specific trivial names when preceded by serial letters or serial numerals at the time of their original publication .. 140

15. Article 19 and *Opinions* 26, 27, 29, 36, 41, 60, 61, and 63 (emendation of names) 141

16. Article 25 and *Opinion* 2 (status of a name based on a hypothetical form) 144

17. Article 25 and *Opinion* 49 (status of a specific name published conditionally) 144

18. Article 25 and *Opinion* 4 (status of a name which, prior to being first validly published with an " indication," was in currency as a manuscript name) 145

19. Article 25 and *Opinions* 87, 59, and 191 (various aspects of the problem of publication) 146

20. Articles 30 and 35 and *Opinion* 148 (status of a generic name published as an invalid emendation of an earlier name and type species of genus so named) 147

21. Article 25, Proviso (*a*) and *Opinion* 1 (meaning of the expression " indication ") 148

22. Article 25, Proviso (*a*) and *Opinion* 43 (status of a new specific name published jointly with a new generic name and *vice versa*) .. 149

23. Article 25, Proviso (*a*) and *Opinion* 52 (significance to be attached to the citation of a type locality in an original description) .. 150

24. Article 25, Proviso (*b*) and *Opinion* 5 (status of a name originally published before 1758, when republished after 1757) 150

25. Article 26 and *Opinion* 3 (relative status of works published in the year 1758) 150

26. Articles 25 and 31 and *Opinion* 88 (status of a specific name published for a composite nominal species) 151

27. Article 30, Rule (*a*) and *Opinion* 7 (type species of a genus the name of which was published with the formula " n.g., n.sp.") .. 152

Sixth Meeting (*continued*)

Page

28. Article 30, Rule (*c*) and *Opinion* 47 (type species of a genus for which only one nominal species is cited by the original author) .. 153

29. Article 30, Rule (*d*) and *Opinion* 18 (type species of a genus an included nominal species of which has a synonym possessing a tautonymous trivial name not cited in original publication) .. 153

30. Article 30, Rule (*d*) and *Opinion* 16 (type species of a genus of which an included species had a pre-1758 tautonymous univerbal specific name cited as a synonym) 154

31. Article 30, Rule (*f*) and *Opinion* 35 (type species of a substitute genus where one or more of the originally included species not cited under a binominal name) 155

32. Article 30, Rule (*g*) and *Opinion* 35 (type species of a genus where one or more of the originally included species not cited under a binominal name) 155

33. Article 30, Rule (*g*) and *Opinion* 10 (type species of genera having identical limits) 156

34. Article 30, Rule (*g*) and *Opinion* 62 (a nominal species eligible for selection as the type species of more than one nominal genus) 156

35. Article 30 and *Opinion* 164 (type species of a genus not affected by the subjective union of that genus with another genus) .. 157

36. Article 30, Rule (*g*) and *Opinion* 6 (special method of selecting the type species of a genus established before 1931 and with only two included nominal species) 157

37. Article 30, Rule (*g*) and *Opinion* 14 (selection of a nominal species to be the type species of a genus not invalidated where the author making the selection himself misidentifies the species which he so selects) 157

38. Article 30 (all Rules) and *Opinions* 65 and 168 (the original author of a generic name to be assumed to have identified correctly the nominal species referred by him to the genus so named) .. 158

39. Article 30 and *Opinion* 46 (selection of a type species for a genus to which no nominal species was distinctly referred—by the original author) 159

40. Article 30 and *Opinion* 172 (selection of the type species of a genus in a literature-recording serial) 161

Sixth Meeting (*continued*)

Page

41. Article 34 and *Opinion* 147 (application to generic names of provisions in third paragraph of Article 35) 161

42. Article 34 and *Opinion* 25 (clarification of provisions determining whether one generic name is identical with another) 162

43. Article 35 (definition of conditions in which one trivial name is to be regarded as identical with another) 162

44. Article 34 and *Opinions* 125 and 148 (status of emendations in relation to generic homonymy) 163

45. Article 34 and *Opinion* 148, paragraph (3) : interpretation in, not to be incorporated in the *Règles* and to be cancelled 163

46. Articles 34 and 35 and *Opinion* 102 (status of a generic or trivial name when a homonym of the name of a unit of sub-ordinal or higher category) 164

47. Articles 25, 34 and 35 and *Opinion* 145 (subsequent status of a name first published in a work rejected for nomenclatorial purposes) 165

48. Article 25 (the expression " divulgué dans une publication ") : postponement of consideration of interpretations of, in *Opinions* 15 and 51 165

49. Repeal, either wholly or in part, for interpretative purposes, of certain *Opinions* rendered by the Commission 165

50. Resolutions on questions relating to nomenclature embodied in *Declarations* rendered by the Commission : proposed codification of 166

51. *Declarations* 1 and 12 (Code of Ethics) 167

52. *Declaration* 4 (avoidance of intemperate language in the discussion of zoological nomenclature) 167

53. *Declaration* 2 (avoidance of issue of separates in advance of the publication of the paper concerned) 167

54. *Declaration* 6 (need for clearly indicating as new every name when first published) 168

55. *Declaration* 6 (need for avoiding the publication of a name as new on more than one occasion) 169

Sixth Meeting (*continued*)

Page

56. *Declarations* 3 and 8 (need for giving a clear indication of date of publication) 169

57. *Declaration* 7 (need for citation of bibliographical references) . . 170

58. *Declaration* 11 (need for indicating the systematic position of new taxonomic units) 170

59. Repeal, except for historical purposes, of *Declarations* so far rendered by the Commission 171

60. Miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles* : first instalment to be considered item by item . . 171

61. Article 8 : need for brevity in generic names, insertion of *Recommandation* regarding 171

62. Article 13 : deletion of provision permitting the use of a capital initial letter for a trivial name in certain cases 172

63. Article 14 : need for brevity in specific and subspecific trivial names, insertion of *Recommandation* regarding 173

64. Examples cited in the *Règles* from works by non-binominal authors to be replaced by examples from works by binominal authors 173

65. Article 22 : abbreviation of authors' names, substitution of a revised *Recommandation* regarding 174

66. Articles 25, 34 and 35 : apparent new names or new combinations due to errors in literature-recording serials, status of, defined 175

67. Article 25, Proviso (*b*) : expression " principes de la nomenclature binominale," meaning of, defined 175

68. Article 30 : generic names published after 31st December, 1930, applicability to, clarified 175

69. Article 30 : removal of ambiguities in, by insertion of drafting amendments 177

70. All Articles : substitution in, of the expressions " nominal genus " and " nominal species " for the expressions " genus " and " species " in certain cases 180

71. Article 30 : elimination of the expression " Rule " from non-mandatory provisions 180

Sixth Meeting (*continued*)

Page

72. Article 30, Rule (*g*) : clarification of 181

73. Article 31 : clarification of 182

74. Article 35 : status of emendations in relation to homonymy in the names of species and lower taxonomic categories, definition of 182

75. Terminology of type specimens, insertion in the *Règles* of provisions regarding 184

76. Consideration of Points (15) to (20) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12 postponed until the Seventh Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session 188

77. Seventh and Eighth Meetings of the Commission during its Paris Session : date and time appointed 189

CONCLUSIONS of the Seventh Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Thursday, 22nd July 1948 at 2030 hours.

1. New Article regarding terminology of type specimens : addition of a further *Recommandation* 190

2. New provision : nominotypical subspecies, insertion of a provision for naming of 191

3. Neotypes (suggested recognition as a category of type specimens) : Secretary invited to prepare comprehensive Report on .. 191

4. New Article : misuse of the *Règles* in a manner calculated to give political, religious or personal offence, insertion of a provision to prevent 193

5. All Articles : adoption of drafting amendments to secure greater clarity and to eliminate unnecessary and undefined repetitive phrases 194

6. Miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles* : second instalment to be considered item by item .. 195

7. Article 8 : a generic name treated as a noun in the nominative singular but in fact a latinised version of a noun in another language in a case other than the nominative or a number other than the singular, status of, defined 195

Seventh Meeting (*continued*)

Page

8. Article 14: addition of a *Recommandation* urging authors to avoid giving as new trivial names words already so used in allied groups 196

9. Article 15: to be redrafted to eliminate the existing option to link by hyphens the component parts of a trivial name consisting of a compound word 197

10. Article 15: orthography of compound trivial names, where the first part of the compound consists of a numeral, insertion of provisions relating to 198

11. Article 14: formation of trivial names based upon the names of persons, clarification of provisions relating to 200

12. Seventeen propositions submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (Toulouse): position regarding, reviewed 209

13. Article 18 (nomenclature of hybrids): adoption of drafting amendments 212

14. Article 25: names published either anonymously or over initials only, status of, defined 213

15. Article 25: the expression "divulgué dans une publication," definition of 215

16. Article 25: names of new taxonomic units published in abstracts in advance of the paper containing the description of the new unit, status of, defined 221

17. Article 25: generic and trivial names first published in keys, status of, defined 222

18. Article 25: date of publication of a given book or paper, criteria to be adopted for determining 223

19. Article 25: citation of date of publication of a name, insertion of a *Recommandation* regarding 225

20. Article 25: a name published on one date where the relevant description or part of it is published at a later date, priority to be accorded to, determined 226

21. Article 25: a trivial name published in conjunction with a generic name which does not comply with the requirements of Proviso (*c*), status of, determined 227

Seventh Meeting (*continued*)

Page

22. Schedule replacing the former *Appendice* to the *Règles* : addition to, of a Section on the transliteration of words from the Cyrillic to the Latin alphabet 228

23. Eighth Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session : date and time noted 229

CONCLUSIONS of the Eighth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Friday, 23rd July 1948 at 0900 hours.

(*Meeting held concurrently with the First Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature*)

1. Procedure to be adopted at the present (eighth) Meeting 230

2. Emendation to *Psolos* of the spelling of the generic name *Psodos* Treitschke, 1827 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) : communication by M. H. Berthet, and decision thereon 231

3. Extension, and incorporation in the *Règles*, of the provisions relating to the Commission's plenary powers : communication by Dr. H. Lemche, and decision thereon 231

4. Incorporation in the *Règles* of a provision establishing a Law of Prescription limiting the Law of Priority : communication by Dr. H. Lemche, and decision thereon 232

5. Nomenclature of Protozoan and other parasites of Man, need for stabilisation of : communication by Alternate Commissioner E. Beltrán, and decision thereon 235

6. "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" : addition to regulations relating to, of a provision designed to eliminate taxonomic considerations 237

7. Ninth and Tenth Meetings of the Commission during its Paris Session : date and time appointed 237

CONCLUSIONS of the Ninth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Friday, 23rd July, 1948 at 2030 hours.

1. Miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles* : Third instalment to be considered item by item .. 239

Ninth Meeting (*continued*)

Page

2. Article 27 : insertion of words to make it clear that this Article applies *inter alia* to names given to forms of polymorphic species 239

3. Article 35, third paragraph (polymorphism in trivial names arising from the use of the same word in noun and adjectival form) : clarification of position regarding 240

4. Articles 34 and 35, third paragraph : addition of a further category 243

5. Articles 34 and 35 (words differing from one another solely by having as the accented syllable the syllable " an " or " en ") : insertion of a *Recommandation* urging avoidance of 243

6. Article 4 (situation where the application of existing provisions leads to the establishment of identical family names in different groups) : procedure to be followed 243

7. Article 4 (name to be applied to a family where two or more existing families are united on taxonomic grounds) : postponement of decision pending general inquiry 244

8. Article 3 : definition of the expression " Latin " as there used .. 245

9. Article 4 (method to be followed in forming a family name from a given generic name) : removal of ambiguities in 246

10. Article 14 (agreement in gender with the generic name of a trivial name when an adjective) : rules for determining gender of generic names 246

11. Article 25, Proviso (*c*) : point of time as from which effective more precisely defined 250

12. Appendice to the *Règles* : errors in Section " G " to be corrected .. 250

13. Article 14 : a trivial name consisting of an unchanged surname of a modern personage treated as a Latin or Latinised word, to be automatically corrected 251

14. Article 14 : a trivial name consisting of a phonetic reproduction of initials of one or more persons to be accepted as complying with 252

15. Article 8 : *Recommandations* attached to, to be converted into mandatory provisions 253

16. Articles 8 and 14 : *Recommendations* condemning names suggesting a bizarre or other objectionable meaning in some language other than Latin to be inserted in 253

Ninth Meeting (*continued*)

Page

17. Article 23 : clarification of, in certain respects 254

18. Article 25 : a description of the work of an animal but not of the animal itself declared to constitute an " indication " 255

19. Article 25 : a generic name based solely upon a figure declared to have been published with an " indication " 255

20. Trivial name *aegyptiellus* Strand, 1909 conditionally published for a subspecies of *Halictus morbillosus* Kirchbaumer, 1873 : status of, determined 256

21. Article 25 : the citation of the host species in an original description of parasite, significance of, defined 256

22. Article 25 : the citation of a geological horizon in original description of a fossil species, significance of, defined 256

23. Article 25 : the expression " le plus anciennement designé " defined 257

24. Article 28 (relative advantages of the " first reviser " and " page precedence " principles) : Secretary invited to prepare Report on 257

25. Article 22 : Dr. Jacot's proposal for deletion of, rejected 258

26. Article 23 : proposal by the American Malacological Society for deletion of, rejected 258

27. Article 1 and Articles 34 and 35 : co-ordination of, in relation to the names of species transferred from the Animal Kingdom to the Vegetable Kingdom 258

28. Article 25 : authorship of *nomina nuda* and manuscript names when first validly published with an " indication " determined .. 259

29. Article 30 (interpretation of Rule (*g*)) 260

30. New Article : title to be given to the *Règles* as amended by the present Congress 260

31. New Schedule or Schedules to the *Règles* : addition of, for recording decisions by the Commission on the invalidity of books or names 261

32. New Article : words having the terminations " -idae " and " -inae," restriction on use of, except for names of families and subfamilies 261

Ninth Meeting (*continued*) Page

33. Article 12 : redrafting of, to eliminate confusion between taxonomy and nomenclature 262

34. Article 7 : redrafting of, to eliminate confusion between taxonomy and nomenclature 262

35. Articles 6 and 11 : co-ordination of texts 263

36. Articles 19 and 32 : co-ordination of texts 263

37. Article 8 : amendment of provision proposed in replacement of *Recommandation* (2) 263

38. Article 36 (*Recommandation* adopted at Padua relative to precedence to be given to generic and subgeneric and to specific and subspecific homonyms of the same date) : deletion of, and insertion of corresponding mandatory provisions in Articles 34 and 35 265

39. Article 36 : reallocation to Articles 34 and 36 of *Recommandations* other than Padua *Recommandation* 265

40. *Opinion* 124 : alleged subgeneric names published by Linnaeus and Fabricius, completion of decision given in 266

41. " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " : status of names placed on, defined 267

42. " Official List of Specific Names in Zoology " : establishment of, and status of names placed on, defined 269

43. " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " : additional provision relating to 271

44. Tenth Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session : date and time noted 271

CONCLUSIONS of the Tenth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Saturday, 24th July, 1948 at 0900 hours.

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Second Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature*)

1. Nomenclature of supergeneric groups below family level : communication by Professor R. Jeannel 273

Tenth Meeting (*continued*) *Page*

2. Nomenclature of families and subfamilies: Professor Robert L. Usinger's communication to form part of material for general inquiry 273

3. The concepts "grade" and "pseudogenus": communication by M. Georges Deflandre 273

4. Fragments (organites and sclerites) of fossil invertebrates, new system of terminology for: communication by M. Georges Deflandre and Mme. Marthe Deflandre-Rigaud 274

5. Clerck, 1757, *Aranei svecici* (status for nomenclatorial purposes of the names published in): preliminary discussion on .. 274

6. Report to be submitted by the Commission to the Congress on the work performed during the Paris Session 277

7. Eleventh Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session: date and time noted 278

CONCLUSIONS of the Eleventh Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July, 1948 at 0930 hours.

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Third Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature*)

1. Apology by the Acting President for late arrival 280

2. Programme for the meetings to be held during the day 281

3. Election of Professor K. Mansour (Egypt) to be an Alternate Member of the Commission for the duration of the Paris Session 282

4. Withdrawal of Professor R. Spärck (Denmark) and nomination of Dr. H. Lemche (Denmark) as prospective Danish Member of the Commission 282

5. Report to be submitted by the Commission to the Congress: detailed examination of draft proposed 283

    (a) Danish representation on the Commission and the arrangements proposed to be adopted in place of the system of three nine-year Classes in the membership of the Commission 283

    (b) Proposed "Official List" of trivial names of species: title to be changed 283

Eleventh Meeting (*continued*) *Page*

(c) Verification of text of revised *Règles :* an *ad hoc* Editorial Committee substituted for the Executive Committee of the Commission 284

6. Unanimous adoption by the Commission of its Report to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology 287

7. Miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles :* fourth instalment to be considered item by item .. 288

8. Article 32 : suggested amendment to provide for the rejection of trivial names on grounds of inappropriateness in certain cases 288

9. *Opinion* 124 : extension to cover certain terms intermediate between generic and trivial names published by Hubner (J.) 289

10. New Article, insertion in *Règles* of, defining the functions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature .. 290

11. Article 25 : status of a holotype or lectotype in relation to an inadequate original description, clarification of position regarding 292

12. Article 25 : priority to be accorded to a name published in a work issued in instalments where that name is published on one date and the relevant description or part of it at a later date : supplementary decision regarding 293

13. The expressions "grade" and "pseudo-genus": proposed recognition of, in the *Règles* rejected 293

14. New system of nomenclature for fragments of fossil invertebrates found in sedimentary rocks : proposed introduction of, rejected 294

15. New Article, insertion in the *Règles* of, defining status of interpretations of the *Règles* given in *Declarations* rendered by the Commission in periods between meetings of the Congress .. 294

16. New Article, insertion in the *Règles* of, defining the method to be followed in amending the *Règles* 295

17. Article 35 (polymorphism in trivial names arising from the use of the same word in noun and adjectival form) : addition of a further example in the *Recommandation* agreed to be inserted in the *Règles* 295

Eleventh Meeting (*continued*) *Page*

18. New Article relating to the plenary powers of the Commission: drafting amendment in 296

19. Neotypes (erroneous statements regarding, deletion of, from *Opinion* 128) 296

20. Article 8: addition to be made to Section (*b*) of the second of the existing *Recommandations* prior to its incorporation in the *Règles* as a mandatory provision 297

21. All Articles: addition of paragraph numbers in the case of composite Articles 297

22. All Articles: addition of serial numbers where there is more than one *Recommandation* in any given Article 298

23. All Articles: each paragraph of an Article or *Recommandation* to consist of a single sentence 298

24. Article 30, Rule (*e*): clarification of 298

25. Article 30: expression to be used to denote the concept of a type species of a genus 299

26. *Necator* Stiles, 1903 (Class Nematoda), an invalid name inadvertently placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" (in *Opinion* 66): validation of, under the plenary powers.. .. 300

27. *Tethys* and *Aplysia* (Class Gastropoda): validation, under the plenary powers, of long-established use of, and matters incidental thereto 301

28. *Venus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Pelecypoda): designation of type species of, under the plenary powers 304

29. *Bulla* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Gastropoda): designation of type species of, under the plenary powers 305

30. Twelfth Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session: time appointed 305

CONCLUSIONS of the Twelfth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July, 1948 at 1445 hours.

(Meeting held concurrently with the Fourth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature)

Page

1. *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801 (Class Pelecypoda), problem of type species of : communication by M. Gilbert Ranson 306
2. Generic names published in books dealing with classification of taxonomic units down to the genus level but no further (case of Brünnich, 1771, *Zoologiae Fundamenta*) : status of, defined 207
3. *Tonna* Brünnich, 1771 (Class Gastropoda) : addition of, to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 310
4. *Cercopithecus* validated as a generic name as from Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Mammalia, Order Primates), and type species designated, under the plenary powers 310
5. *Limulus* Müller, 1785 (Class Arachnida, Order Xiphosura) (placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" by *Opinion* 104), a synonym of *Xiphosura* Brünnich, 1771 : Secretary asked to Report on situation so disclosed 311
6. *Orthoceros* Brünnich, 1771 : decision on, postponed, pending further consultation with palaeontologists 312
7. *Manatus* Brünnich, 1771, *Rosmarus* Brünnich, 1771, and *Ammonia* Brünnich, 1771 : Secretary asked to report on 313
8. Brisson, 1762, *Regnum Animale* (status of generic names published in) : consideration of, postponed.. 313
9. *Hyaena* Brisson, 1762, *Lutra* Brisson, 1762, and *Meles* Brisson, 1762 : postponement of proposal for addition to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology," pending decision on status of Brisson's *Regnum Animale* under Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 314
10. Clerck, 1757, *Aranei svecici* (status for nomenclatorial purposes of names published in) : discussion on, concluded and names validated by addition of a proviso to Article 26 of the *Règles* 315
11. *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856, suppressed, and *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858 (Class Trematoda) validated, under the plenary powers 319

Twelfth Meeting (*continued*) *Page*

12. Miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles :* fifth instalment to be considered item by item .. 323

13. New Article on the plenary powers of the Commission : insertion in, of provision regarding use of, in relation to particular purposes 323

14. New Article on the plenary powers of the Commission : insertion in, of provisions regarding application of, to cases of doubt arising from impossibility of determining the species to which a given trivial name should apply 324

15. New Article, insertion of, relating to composition of the Commission 325

16. New Article, insertion of, relating to the By-Laws of the Commission 327

17. Article 28 (relative merits of the " first reviser " and " page precedence " principles) : Report by Secretary considered and amendment of Article 28 agreed 328

18. New Article on the plenary powers : supplementary provisions relating to procedure 331

19. New Schedule, insertion of, in the *Règles*, to record decisions in regard to individual books or names taken by the Commission otherwise than under their plenary powers 332

20. New Schedule or Schedules, insertion of, in the *Règles*, containing the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " and " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " and corresponding " Official Indexes of Rejected and Invalid Names " 333

21. Cancellation and amendment of certain *Opinions* already published prior to incorporation in Schedules to the *Règles* 335

22. *Opinions* 31, 68, 69, 78, 99, 129 : supplementary decisions in regard to 337

23. New Article on the plenary powers, insertion in, of a drafting amendment regarding procedure to be followed when names are suppressed 338

24. Schedules to the *Règles :* procedure to be followed in the transfer thereto of decisions recorded in *Opinions* rendered by the Commission 339

Twelfth Meeting (*continued*)

Page

25. New Schedule containing the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology"; gender of generic names in, to be specified .. 341

26. Revision of the *Règles* by the Paris Congress; arrangements to be made for early promulgation and entry into force .. 341

27. Miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles*: sixth instalment to be considered item by item .. 342

28. Article 35: status of the later published of two identical trivial names where two species having that name are placed in different genera which, through the accident of undetected homonymy, bear the same generic name; previous decision relating to, reversed 343

29. Article 25, Proviso (*a*): the expression "indication" in relation to generic and trivial names; amplification of previous decision relating to 345

30. Article 30: species eligible for selection as the type species of a genus where no nominal species was distinctly referred to the genus by its original author, amplification of previous decision relating to 346

31. Article 30: clarification of certain ambiguities in 346

32. Article 25: subspecific trivial names where, on being first published, preceded by a serial letter or by a serial numeral, position of, defined 348

33. Revision of the *Règles* by the Paris Congress: date of entry into force 348

34. Article 34 and *Opinion* 116: generic names differing from one another only by the terminations "-nus" and "-mus", position as regards homonymy defined 349

35. Article 25: status of a name first published in a work rejected for nomenclatorial purposes, amplification of previous decision regarding 350

36. Article 25: status of a generic name when first published in a specific synonymy, clarification of position of 350

37. Article 30: question of the type species of a genus, the name of which was first published in a generic synonymy, comprehensive Report by Secretary asked for 351

Twelfth Meeting (*continued*) Page

38. Thirteenth Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session : time appointed 352

CONCLUSIONS of the Thirteenth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July, 1948 at 1730 hours.

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Fifth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature*)

1. Eight individual problems of nomenclature raised in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19 : proposals relating to, to be discussed item by item 354

2. *Opinions* rendered without including an answer to all the points raised : arrangements for completion of 355

3. *Calliphora* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) to be added to the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " (decision completing *Opinion* 82) 355

4. *Mabuya* Fitzinger, 1826 (Class Reptilia), amendment in the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " of entry relating to (correction of error in *Opinion* 92) 356

5. *Porina* Walker, 1856 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) : proposed validation of, under the Commission's plenary powers, rejected 356

6. *Flebotomus* Rondani, 1840 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) : emendation to *Phlebotomus* under the plenary powers.. 358

7. *Papilio plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) : determination of identity of, under the plenary powers 359

8. *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), type species of : Secretary to furnish Report on, and decision to be taken thereon with minimum of further delay 361

9. Individual nomenclatorial problems involving controversial, though not necessarily difficult, issues : need for avoidance of unnecessary delays in reaching decisions regarding .. 363

10. Linnaean binominal system of nomenclature not available for nomenclature of monsters : names published for such purposes to have no status in zoological nomenclature 363

Thirteenth Meeting (*continued*) *Page*

11. Applications relating to individual problems of nomenclature: cases published in the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature " to have priority of consideration 364

12. Part 5 of Volume I of the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature ": applications published in, to be considered in turn 364

13. Oken, 1815–1816, *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte*, status of new names published in, consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained 365

14. Geoffroy (E. L.), 1762, *Hist. Ins. Env. Paris :* new names published in, declared not available under the *Règles* 366

15. *Corixa* Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera): validation of, and designation of type species of, under the plenary powers 369

16. *Naucoris* Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera): question of validation of, under the plenary powers postponed for additional information to be obtained 370

17. " *Buprestidae*," a pamphlet believed to have been written by F. W. Hope and distributed in 1836: declared not published within the meaning of Article 25.. 371

18. Part 8 of Volume I of the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature ": applications published in, to be considered in turn 372

19. Koch (C.L.), 1835–1842, *Deutschlands Crustaceen, Myriapoden und Arachniden :* definition of species eligible for selection as type species of genera first named in 372

20. *Diaptomus vulgaris* Schmeil, 1897 (Class Crustacea, Order Copepoda): validation, under the plenary powers, of the trivial name *vulgaris* 375

21. The generic name *Graptolithus* Linnaeus, 1768, and the specific name *Graptolithus scalaris* Linnaeus, 1768 (Class Graptolithina, Order *Graptoloidea*): suppression of, under the plenary powers .. 377

22. *Monograptus* (emend. of *Monograpsus*) Geinitz, 1852 (Class Graptolithina, Order Graptoloidea): validation of, under the plenary powers 378

23. *Retiolites* Barrande, 1850 (Class Graptolithina, Order Graptoloidea): validation of, under the plenary powers 378

24. *Diplodinium* Schuberg, 1888 (Class Ciliophora): trivial name of type species of, determined 379

Thirteenth Meeting (*continued*)

Page

25. *Aspidoproctus* Newstead [April] 1901 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera): addition of, to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 381

26. Article 25: a specific name based upon a specimen which is undescribed but which formed part of the type series of a previously described species, declared not to satisfy Proviso (*a*) 382

27. *Diadema* Gray, 1825 (Class Echinoidea): validation of, and designation of type species of, under the plenary powers .. 383

28. Orders and higher taxonomic units (problem of obtaining uniformity in nomenclature of): Secretary invited to prepare a comprehensive Report on 385

29. *Fasciola ovata* Rudolphi, 1803 (Class Trematoda, Order Digenea), a composite nominal species: action by Braun when determining taxonomic identity of, declared correct under Article 31 .. 386

30. *Petalifera* Gray, 1847, and *Aplysiella* Fischer, 1872 (Class Gastropoda): relative status of 387

31. *Acme* Hartmann, 1821, *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, and *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1830 (Class Gastropoda): relationship to one another under Article 34 determined; specialists to be consulted about possible use of plenary powers 389

32. *Ammonites cordatus* Sowerby, 1813 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea): designation of lectotype of, under the plenary powers 392

33. *Actinote* Hübner [1819] (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera): designation of type species of, under the plenary powers .. 393

34. *Hemerobius* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Chrysopa* Leach, 1815 (Class Insecta, Order Neuroptera): designation of type species of, under the plenary powers 395

35. Articles 34 and 35: position of a *nomen dubium* in relation to generic and specific homonymy defined 397

36. *Palaeaneilo* Hall, 1869 (Class Pelecypoda): emendation of, to *Palaeoneilo* under Article 19 399

37. Part 9 of Volume I of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*: applications published in, to be considered in turn 400

Thirteenth Meeting (*continued*) *Page*

38. Article 5 : position when the type genus of a family is united with another genus having an older name and the combined genus is treated as belonging to the same family as a third genus, having an older name than either of the other genera, problem of, to be dealt with in Report to be prepared by Secretary .. 401

39. Pallas (P. S.), *Zoographia rosso-asiatica :* dates of publication of the several volumes of, determined 402

40. *Clavellarius* Olivier, 1789 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) : suppression of, under the plenary powers (decision supplementary to *Opinion* 144) 403

41. *Bombus* Latreille, 1802 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) : validation of, under the plenary powers, in so far as necessary 404

42. *Ceratina* Latreille [1802–1803], and *Diodontus* Curtis, 1834 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera, application for use of plenary powers for : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained 407

43. *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Camponotus* Mayr, 1861 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) : addition of, to the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 408

44. *Gorytes* Latreille [Sept., 1804], *Harpactus* Shuckard, 1837, *Macropis* Panzer [1806–1809] (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera), applications for use of plenary powers for : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained .. 410

45. *Megachile* Latreille, 1802 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) : type species of, determined 411

46. Seven generic names in the Order Hymenoptera (Class Insecta), applications for use of plenary powers for : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained 413

47. Two species of the Order Hymenoptera (Class Insecta), proposed use of the plenary powers to conserve the trivial names in common use for : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained 416

48. *Erycina* Lamarck, 1805 (Class Pelecypoda) : designation of type species of, under the plenary powers 417

49. Gesner, 1758, *Tractatus physicus de petrificatis :* suppression of, for nomenclatorial purposes, under the plenary powers 418

Thirteenth Meeting (*continued*) *Page*

50. *Liodes* Heyden, 1826 (Class Arachnida, Order Acarina): to be rejected as a homonym of *Leiodes* Latreille, 1796 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) 420

51. Report to the Congress on the work performed during the Paris Session: two supplementary points submitted to the Section on Nomenclature 421

52. Fourteenth Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session: time appointed 424

CONCLUSIONS of the Fourteenth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July, 1948 at 2030 hours.

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Sixth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature*)

1. Part 10 of Volume I of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*: applications published in, to be considered in turn 425

2. *Raphistoma* Rafinesque, 1815, and *Belone* Oken, 1815 (Class Pisces, Order Synentognathi) suppressed, and *Raphistoma* Hall, 1847 (Class Gastropoda) and *Belone* Cuvier, 1817 (Class Pisces, Order Synentognathi) validated, under the plenary powers 426

3. *Teleosteus* Volger, 1860, and the trivial name *primaevus* Volger, 1860 (as published in the binominal combination *Teleosteus primaevus*): suppression of, under the plenary powers .. 428

4. The trivial name *mcfarlandi* (as published in the binominal combination *Chromodoris mcfarlandi*) (Class Gastropoda, Order Opisthobranchia): emendation of, to *macfarlandi* under Article 19 430

5. The species commonly treated as having been named *Piroplasma annulatum* by Dschunkowsky & Luhs in 1904 (Class Sporozoa, Order Coccidiida), identity of: consideration postponed for further information to be obtained regarding date of publication 431

6. *Tremataspis* Schmidt, 1866 (a genus based upon a misidentified type species) (Class Cephalaspidomorphi, Order Osteostraci): designation of type species of, under the plenary powers 433

Fourteenth Meeting (*continued*) Page

7. *Anomia pecten* Linnaeus, 1758 : identification of, under the plenary powers, with the species of the Class Brachiopoda (Order Protremata) commonly known as *Strophomena pecten* (Linnaeus, 1758) 435

8. *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829 (Class Mammalia, Order Rodentia), question of type species of : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained 438

9. *Aturoidea*, a term applied by Vredenberg (1925) to a " section " of the genus *Nautilus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Nautiloidea) : declared to be of subgeneric status as from date of being so published 441

10. *Bradycellus* Erichson, 1837 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera), proposed use of the plenary powers for : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained 443

11. *Carabus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) : designation of type species of, under the plenary powers .. 445

12. *Harpalus* Latreille [1802–1803] and *Ophonus* Stephens, 1827, *Lebia* Latreille [1802–1803], *Tachys* Stephens, 1828, and *Trechus* Schellenberg, 1806 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera), application for the use of the plenary powers for : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained 446

13. Part 11 of Volume I of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* : applications published in, to be considered in turn 448

14. *Dinornis novaezealandiae* Owen, 1842 (Class Aves, Order Dinorniformes) : determination of lectotype of, under Article 31 .. 448

15. Martin (W.), 1793, *Fig. Descr. Petrif. Derbyshire*, and 1809, *Petrificata Derbiensia* : declared not available for nomenclatorial purposes 450

16. Twelve generic names in the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta), published in 1807 by Fabricius and Illiger in different senses : suppression under the plenary powers of the names so published by Illiger 452

17. *Hygriobia* Latreille, 1804 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera): emendation of, to *Hygrobia* under Article 19 459

18. *Schwagerina* von Möller, 1877 (Class Rhizopoda, Order Foraminifera) : determination of type species of 461

Fourteenth Meeting (*continued*) Page

19. *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) validated, and *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796, suppressed, under the plenary powers 464

20. *Salda* Fabricius, 1803 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera): designation of type species of, under the plenary powers 467

21. Names of ten genera in the Order Hemiptera (Class Insecta), based upon misidentified type species: (1) type species of *Gastrodes* Westwood, 1840, designated under the plenary powers; (2) type species of remaining genera similarly designated conditionally 469

22. Certain applications not yet published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*: the Commission's files relating to, to be examined in turn 474

23. The trivial name *idas* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio idas*) suppressed, and the trivial name *idas* Linnaeus, 1761 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio idas*) (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) validated, and its application defined, under the plenary powers, and matters incidental thereto 475

24. Six generic names in the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta) placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" and three generic names in the same Order placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" .. 480

25. The "*Hildesheim List* [1839]": suppression of, for nomenclatorial purposes, under the plenary powers 486

26. Hübner (J.) [1806], *Tentamen*: (1) the valid names of the genera for certain of the species cited in, placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology"; (2) procedure to be adopted for determining the valid generic names for the remaining species cited in 488

27. *Papilio podalirius* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera): identity of, determined under the plenary powers .. 497

28. Article 31, need for elaboration of, to cover certain special cases: Secretary invited to prepare a comprehensive Report on .. 499

29. Meuschen's Index to Gronovius, 1763–1781, *Zoophylacium Gronovianum*: rejection of, for nomenclatorial purposes 502

Fourteenth Meeting (*continued*)

30. *Podura* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Tomoceros* Nicolet, 1842 (Class Insecta, Order Collembola): designation of type species of, under the plenary powers; *Podura* Linnaeus, 1758, correction in "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" of entry relating to 504

31. *Amplypterus* Hübner [1819] (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera): determination of type species of 507

32. Phylum Echinodermata: eight applications for the use of the plenary powers to validate accepted nomenclatorial usage submitted by Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark), preliminary considerations relating to 509

33. *Echinocrinus* Agassiz, 1841 (Class Echinoidea, Order Cidaroida), proposed suppression of, and *Archaeocidaris* M'Coy, 1844, proposed validation of, under the plenary powers: consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained .. 514

34. *Echinocyamus* van Phelsum, 1774, and *Fibularia* Lamarck, 1816 (Class Echinoidea, Order Clypeastroida): designation of type species of, under the plenary powers 516

35. *Phyllacanthus* (Class Echinoidea, Order Cidaroida) and *Strongylocentrotus* (Class Echinoidea, Order Camarodonta) validated as of subgeneric status as from Brandt, 1835, under the plenary powers 519

36. *Spatangus* Gray, 1825, *Ova* Gray, 1825, *Schizaster* Agassiz [1836], *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825, *Moira* Agassiz, 1872, and *Brissus* Gray, 1825 (Class Echinoidea, Order Spatangoida): validation of current nomenclatorial practice in regard to, under the plenary powers 522

37. *Arachnoides* Leske, 1778, and *Echinorachnius* Gray, 1825 (Class Echinoidea) validated under the plenary powers, and, with *Echinodiscus* Leske, 1778 (Class Echinoidea) placed on the "Official List of Genetic Names in Zoology" 530

38. *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Pisces, Order Discocephali), designation of type species of, under the plenary powers; the position of *Echeneis* Linnaeus on the "Official List" confirmed, and *Remora* Gill, 1862 (Class Pisces, Order Discocephali) added thereto 536

39. *Papilio iris* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera): identity of, determined under the plenary powers 540

Fourteenth Meeting (*continued*) *Page*

40. The trivial names *ascanius* Linnaeus, 1768 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio ascanius*) and *aristolochiae* Pallas (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio aristolochiae*), in so far as published prior to 1780, suppressed, and the trivial names *aristolochiae* Fabricius, 1775 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio aristolochiae*) and *ascanius* Cramer [1775] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio ascanius*) (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) validated, under the plenary powers 542

41. Zimmermann (A. E. W. von). 1777, *Specimen Zoologiae geographicae*, declared not available for nomenclatorial purposes ; Zimmermann, 1778–1783, *Geographische Geschichte* declared an available work 545

42. Frisch (J. L.), 1775, *Das Natur-System der vierfüssigen Thiere* : declared not available for nomenclatorial purposes 548

43. *Dama* Zimmermann, 1780, and the specific name *Dama virginiana* Zimmermann, 1780 (Class Mammalia, Order Ungulata) : consideration of status of, postponed for additional information to be obtained 549

44. Meigen (J. G.), 1800, *Nouvelle Classification des Mouches à deux Ailes* (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) : (1) Report by the Secretary regarding ; (2) future procedure on, determined .. 552

45. Individual problems of zoological nomenclature on which decisions had been taken during the present (14th) Meeting of the Commission : Report on, to be submitted to the Section on Nomenclature 559

46. Re-issues of *Opinions* 1–16 : examination (1) of comments on interpretations of the *Règles* given in, and (2) of certain proposals for further action submitted either in " Editorial Notes " attached to, or in footnotes added to 560

47. Article 25 : question whether, when an author, on publishing a manuscript name or republishing with an indication a name previously published as a *nomen nudum*, omits expressly to state that he is so doing, that omission is material to the status of the name so published or republished, clarification of position regarding 562

48. Article 25 : publication of names which had previously existed as manuscript names and republication of names previously published only as *nomina nuda*, addition of a *Recommandation* condemning 563

Fourteenth Meeting (*continued*)

Page

49. Article 21: authorship of names and the method to be adopted in citing authors' names, supplementary provisions adopted regarding 564

50. Nozeman & Vosmaer, 1758, *Geslachten der Vogelen* (a translation into Dutch of a work by Moehring entitled *Avium Genera*, published in 1752): declared not available for nomenclatorial purposes 566

51. Edwards' edition (1771) of Catesby (M.), *Natural History of Carolina* (status of names in): clarification of decision in *Opinion* 89 relating to 568

52. Meuschen (F. C.), 1778, *Museum Gronovianum*: declared not available for nomenclatorial purposes 571

53. Sand Crab (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda): (1) the trivial name *quadratus* Fabricius, 1787 (as published in the binominal combination *Cancer quadratus*) the oldest available trivial name for; (2) *Opinion* 13 to be cancelled as incorrect; (3) a revised *Opinion* to be rendered when views of specialists obtained on action desirable 573

54. *Opinion* 16, certain generic names discussed in, placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 580

55. *Taenia* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Cestoidea): use of the plenary powers (1) to designate *Taenia solium* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of, and (2) to validate an erroneus entry relating to, in the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" (correction of an error in *Opinion* 84) 584

56. Schneider (J. G.), 1784, *Samml. Abhandl. Aufklär. Zoologie Handlungsgeschichte*: (1) suppression under the plenary powers of the generic name *Octopodia* Schneider, 1784, and of five trivial names published in that genus; (2) eight reputed generic names declared to be cheironyms; (3) *Octopus* Cuvier [1797], and *Eledone* Leach, 1817, placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 586

57. *Opinions* already published (individual questions of zoological nomenclature arising in): Report to Section on Nomenclature on conclusions reached by the Commission in regard to .. 590

58. *Opinions* 1–133: arrangements to be made for publication of *facsimile* edition of 591

Fourteenth Meeting (*continued*) *Page*

59. Human malaria parasites, generic and trivial names of : (1) use of the plenary powers to validate existing nomenclatorial practice ; (2) cancellation of erroneous decisions regarding, in *Opinion* 104 ; (3) insertion of amended particulars in the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" and matters incidental thereto 594

60. Article 14(1)(*a*) : a term consisting of an adjective denoting a subspecies or infra-subspecific form of a species, whose trivial name is a noun in the genitive case, declared not to acquire status as a subspecific or infra-subspecific trivial name, if published in grammatical agreement, not with the generic name, but with the trivial name of the species, either expressed or understood 624

61. "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" : clarification of scope of, in certain respects 625

62. Editorial Committee charged with the duty of editing the revised text of the *Règles* : proposals submitted to the Section on Nomenclature in regard to the composition of 628

63. Report to the Congress on work performed by the Commission during the Paris Session : concluding instalment submitted to Section on Nomenclature 630

64. Decisions taken by the Commission in "Opinions" and other publications (method to be adopted for recording of) : consideration of Resolution regarding, submitted on behalf of the Committee on Nomenclature of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 632

65. Minutes of the Meetings of the Commission during its Paris Session : arrangements to be made for finalising the text of 640

66. Thanks of the Commission to those members of the Congress who had served as Alternate Members of the Commission during its Paris Session 644

67. Rising Vote of Thanks to Commissioner Francis Hemming for his services as Secretary to the Commission and as Acting President of the Commission during its Paris Session 645

68. Vote of Thanks to the Secretary-General of the Congress and to the Authorities of the Congress generally 647

69. Close of the Proceedings of the Commission at its Paris Session .. 648

NOTE OF A DECISION taken at an Informal (Fifteenth) Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature held at the Hotel Lutetia, Paris, at the conclusion of the Final Banquet of the Congress on Tuesday, 27th July, 1948 at 2215 hours.

1. Communiqué on the work of the Commission during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology to be issued to the Scientific Press of the World : approval of terms of 649

INDEX 653

Note on dates of publication of the several portions of the present volume.

VOLUME 4. Parts 1/3
pp. T.P.—L, 1—62

21st April, 1950

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

PURCHASED
19 APR 1950

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

CONTENTS :

Page

Title Page ; Thanks to U.N.E.S.C.O. ; Composition of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature ; Note by the President of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948, on the date of entry into force of the amendments to the *Règles* decided upon by the Congress ; Particulars of the Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners present at the Paris Session and of the other members of the Congress who attended the meetings of the International Commission ; Note by the Secretary to the Commission on the Class and Ordinal names used in the Official Record of the Proceedings of the Commission at its Paris Session ; Certification of the text of the Official Record of the Proceedings of the Commission at its Paris Session ; Table of Contents TP.—L

The Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July 1948 : Conclusions of First, Second and Third Meetings and first instalment of Conclusions of Fourth Meeting Half-Title, 1-62

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth
International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948,
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the
International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
at the Publications Office of the Trust
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1950

twelve
Price One pound, ~~eight~~ shillings.

(All rights reserved)

THE OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION
ON
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE
AT THEIR SESSION
HELD IN
PARIS IN JULY, 1948

THE OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE AT THEIR SESSION HELD IN PARIS
21st—27th JULY, 1948

(prepared by Secretary Francis Hemming at the request of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 21st–27th July, 1948

CONCLUSIONS of the First Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Ampithéâtre Louis-Liard on Wednesday, 21st July, 1948 at 1430 hours

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary to the Commission*) (*Acting President*)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor Lodovico di Caporiacco (Italy)

Absence of the President and Vice-President and assumption of the Acting Presidency by the Secretary

1. THE SECRETARY (COMMISSIONER FRANCIS HEMMING) informed the Commission that he had two communications to make, both of which would, he felt sure, be a source of great regret to all the Commissioners present : first, he had been informed by President Karl Jordan that he would unfortunately be unable to attend the present session of the Commission, the fact that he was now totally deaf making it impossible for him to take part in oral discussions ; second, he had received a cable from Vice-President James L. Peters expressing his regret that circumstances made it impossible for him to be present. In the absence of the two senior officers of the Commission, it would therefore fall to him (Secretary Hemming) to officiate as Acting President during the Paris Session of the Commission.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note with great regret that neither the President (owing to total deafness) nor the Vice-President of the Commission would be able to be present at the Paris Session of the Commission ;

(2) took note that Commissioner Francis Hemming, as Secretary to the Commission, would, in the absence of the President and the Vice-President, officiate as Acting President of the Commission during the Session of meetings to be held in Paris.

Apologies for absence received from Commissioner Paul Rode (France)

2. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reported that he had been informed by their colleague, Commissioner Paul Rode (France), that, much to his regret, his duties as an officer of another Section of the Congress would make it difficult for him to attend the meetings of the Commission during its present Session.

THE COMMISSION :—

took note of the above statement.

Commissioners present at the Paris Session

3. THE COMMISSION :—

took note that, owing to the high cost of foreign travel, the difficulty in many cases of obtaining foreign exchange and similar causes, it had been possible for only the five undermentioned members of the Commission to attend the Paris Congress and therefore to take part in the present Session of meetings of the Commission :—

Professor H. BOSCHMA (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester BRADLEY (U.S.A.)
Professor Lodovico di CAPORIACCO (Italy)
Mr. Francis HEMMING (United Kingdom) (*Secretary to the Commission*)
Dr. Paul RODE (France).

Resignation of Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark) on account of ill-health

4. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reported that Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark) had had every intention of attending the present meeting and had been keenly looking forward to doing so. Unfortunately, on the advice of his medical attendants, he had had regretfully to cancel his proposed visit to Paris. In the letter announcing this decision, Commissioner Mortensen had asked also to be relieved from further service as a member of the Commission, in order that he might devote the whole of his time and energies to the completion of his monograph of the Echinoidea. All the members of the Commission, as also Dr. Mortensen's many other friends and admirers among the zoologists attending the present Congress, would deeply regret the circumstances responsible for Dr. Mortensen's decision. For the Commission Dr. Mortensen's absence and his prospective retirement from the Office of Commissioner was a keen personal loss. He (the Acting President) felt sure that the members of the Commission would wish him on their behalf to convey to Dr. Mortensen their deep regret at the reasons which made it impossible for him to be present and their sympathy and good wishes.

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 2(*a*))

THE COMMISSION :—

took note with great regret of the reasons which made it impossible for Commissioner Mortensen (Denmark) to attend the present meeting and invited the Acting President to telegraph to Dr. Mortensen expressing their sympathy and good wishes.

Commissioners absent from Paris and unable to attend the Session thereat

(*Previous references: Paris Session, 1st Meeting, Conclusions,* 1 *and* 4)

5. THE COMMISSION :—

took note that, in addition to President Jordan, Vice-President Peters and Commissioner Th. Mortensen, the reasons for whose absence had already been reported, the undermentioned ten members of the Commission had been prevented from attending the present meeting by such causes as the difficulty of obtaining passages, the high cost of foreign travel, and the difficulty in many cases of obtaining the requisite foreign exchange :—

Senhor Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)
Señor Angel Cabrera (Argentina)
Dr. W. T. Calman (United Kingdom)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada)
Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia)
Professor Rudolf Richter (Germany)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.)

Appointment of certain members of the Congress to be Alternate Members of the Commission for the duration of the Paris Session

6. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that, in accordance with the procedure approved by the Ninth International Congress of Zoölogy at its meeting held at Monaco in 1913 and confirmed by subsequent meetings of the Congress, it was the duty of the Commission to complete its membership during Sessions held concurrently with meetings of the International Congress of Zoology by inviting representative zoologists who were attending the Congress to serve during that period as Alternate Members of the Commission with full voting rights, in place of those members of the Commission who were unable to be present at the Congress concerned. The Acting President then outlined the informal discussions to this end which, following precedent, had taken place prior to the opening of the present Congress.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note of, and approved, the arrangements provisionally made for the undermentioned

members of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology to be invited to act as Alternate Members of the Commission with full voting rights during the Session of the Commission to be held in Paris concurrently with the present meeting of the Congress :—

Dr. Edward HINDLE (United Kingdom) *vice* President Karl Jordan (United Kingdom);

Professor Arthur Ricardo JORGE (Portugal) *vice* Commissioner Afranio do Amaral (Brazil);

Professor Harold KIRBY (U.S.A.) *vice* Commissioner Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.);

Professor Z. P. METCALF (U.S.A.) *vice* Vice-President James L. Peters (U.S.A.);

Mr. Norman D. RILEY (United Kingdom) *vice* Commissioner W. T. Calman (United Kingdom);

Professor R. SPÄRCK (Denmark) *vice* Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark);

Professor V. van STRAELEN (Belgium) *vice* Commissioner Rudolf Richter (Germany);

Professor Robert L. USINGER (U.S.A.) *vice* Commissioner Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.);

(2) authorised the Acting President, in consultation with the *Comité Permanent des Congrès Internationaux de Zoologie*, to approach four other zoologists with a view to their serving as Alternate Members of the Commission during the present Session in the place of Commissioners Cabrera, Dymond, Hankó and Pearson, the zoologists to be so approached to be nationals of countries not at present represented on the Commission.

Arrangements for meetings during the Paris Session

7. THE COMMISSION :—

(1) agreed that during their present Session their meetings should be held in public and that any member of the Congress should be free to take part in their discussions and invited the Acting President to place a notice to this effect on the Bulletin Board of the Congress;

(2) invited the Acting President of the Commission to make such arrangements for joint meetings of the Commission and the Section on Nomenclature as he, in his capacity of President of the

Section, might consider best calculated to promote the smooth, rapid and efficient conduct of the business to be dealt with by the Commission and the Section.

Second meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session : date and time appointed

8. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to terminate the present meeting and to meet again forthwith in public, with the Alternate Members of the Commission in their places.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned at* 1440 *hours*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 21st–27th July, 1948

CONCLUSIONS of the Second Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Wednesday, 21st July, 1948 at 1440 hours

PRESENT

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Dr. E. Hindle (United Kingdom)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Professor Z. P. Metcalf (U.S.A.)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor R. Spärck (Denmark)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present :

M. Belloc (France)
Professor E. Beltrán (Mexico)
Professor P. Bonnet (France)
M. André Chavan (France)
Professor Ernest N. Cory (U.S.A.)
M. G. V. Deflandre (France)
Mr. Jean Delacour (U.S.A.)
Professor A. Ghigi (Italy)
M. H. Gisin (Switzerland)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Professor Kamel Mansour (Egypt)
Mr. R. Winckworth (United Kingdom)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*
Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer*

Official Languages at the Paris Session

1. THE COMMISSION :—

(1) recalled that, although the Official Language of the *Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique* was the French language, the Official Language of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature was the English language ;

(2) agreed that at the present Session of meetings communications might be made to the Commission in either English or French,

Procedure to be followed at the Paris Session: suspension of the By-Laws and other matters

2. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that owing to the war no meeting of the Commission had taken place for 13 years, the last meeting being that held in Lisbon in 1935 at the time of the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology. In consequence the Commission and the Section on Nomenclature were faced with an exceptionally heavy agenda for the present meeting. The Commission were anxious to secure the widest measure of co-operation with, and assistance from, zoologists attending the Paris Congress. It was for this reason that the Commission had decided that all their meetings during the present Congress should be held in public. This would enable every member of the Congress who was interested in zoological nomenclature not only to attend the meetings of the Commission but also to take an active part in the discussion of problems brought forward for consideration. Further, in agreement with the Commission, he (the Acting President of the Commission) had decided, in his capacity of President of the Section on Nomenclature, that some of the meetings of the Commission should be held jointly with meetings of the Section. This arrangement would secure important advantages. First, it would give to the members of the Section a more effective responsibility for the decisions taken than would otherwise be possible. Second, it would secure that the best use was made of the limited amount of time available by eliminating the need for detailed discussion of every problem first in the Commission and second in the Section. In order to avoid waste of time, it was essential also that both the Commission and the Section should set on one side any procedural forms which might reduce the scope of, or the rate at which, business could be transacted. In particular, it would be necessary for the Commission to suspend for the duration of the present Session the provision which it had imposed on itself when in 1910 it had included in its By-Laws an Article under which proposals affecting the text of the *Règles* must have been before the Commission for a period of at least one year before recommendations thereon could be submitted to the Congress. Whatever might have been the merits of this provision at the time when it was adopted (and proposals for its modification would be submitted later during the present Session), it was evident that, if the Commission were to allow itself to be bound by this provision on the present occasion, it would be impossible for it to deal with a large part of the urgent and important questions awaiting its attention. It was evident that zoologists in general were looking to the Commission to make the best possible use of the opportunity presented by the present

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion 10*) meeting of the Congress and would consider that the Commission had failed in its duty if it were to permit procedural devices to stultify its action. The task lying before the Commission and the Section was very heavy; hard work, long meetings and close attention to business would be needed if the comprehensive programme of reforms before the Commission was to be carried to a successful issue and decisions taken on the large number of individual cases awaiting attention. In view of the importance of the problems involved and of the clearly expressed desire of zoologists that the Commission should in future conduct its business in a prompt and efficient manner, he was confident that the Commission and the Section would rise to their responsibilities and would crown the Paris meeting with success.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note of the need for the closest attention to business during the Paris Session, in order that decisions might be taken on the large number of important questions awaiting consideration;

(2) agreed that, to facilitate the attainment of the object specified in (1) above, the By-Laws of the Commission should be suspended during the Paris Session.

Deaths of Commissioners since 1935

3. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reported that since their meeting held at Lisbon in 1935 the Commission had lost through death seven of their colleagues, namely Commissioner H. B. Fantham; Commissioner Witmer Stone; Vice-President Charles Wardell Stiles; Commissioner Leonhard Stejneger; Commissioner Frederick Chapman; Commissioner Walther Arndt; Commissioner Jacques Pellegrin. Every one of the colleagues whom the Commission had lost had made a valuable contribution to its work during his period of office and the death of each would be deeply regretted. The Commission would, no doubt, feel an especial sense of loss at the death in 1941 of Vice-President Stiles who at the time of his death had served continuously as a member of the Commission for 45 years, during 38 of which he had held the Office of Secretary to the Commission; and of Commissioner Stejneger who had served as a member of the Commission for 44 years, and by his wide experience and judicial temperament had made a most notable contribution to the work of the Commission.

The Acting President added that Commissioner Arndt (Germany) lost his life during the war in circumstances which constituted an ineffaceable outrage against the whole body of men of science. Denounced to the Gestapo apparently for no other reason than his intellectual integrity and his attachment to the conception of co-operation between men of science, irrespective of nationality, Commissioner Arndt was hurriedly arrested in January, 1944, and shortly afterwards suffered death by the headsman's axe. The whole Commission would deplore the loss which they had sustained as the result of this abominable crime and would emphatically condemn this disgraceful murder.

(*The members of the Commission and other Zoologists present at this point rose in their places and stood for two minutes in silence as a mark of respect to their deceased colleagues.*)

(*On resumption*)

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) agreed to place on record their sincere regret at the loss which they had sustained through the death of Vice-President Stiles and of Commissioners Arndt, Chapman, Fantham, Pellegrin, Stejneger and Stone ;

(2) emphatically condemned the disgraceful murder of Commissioner Arndt by the Gestapo during the war and agreed to invite the Congress to record its detestation of this abominable crime.

Election in 1936 of Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) to be Secretary to the Commission in succession to Commissioner C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.)

4. THE COMMISSION took note :—
that the Office of Secretary to the Commission which was rendered vacant in 1935 by the resignation of Commissioner C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.) had been filled in 1936 by the unanimous election thereto of Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom).

Creation in 1939 of offices of Vice-President and Assistant Secretary o the Commission and election thereto of Commissioners C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.) and James L. Peters (U.S.A.)

5. THE COMMISSION took note :—

(1) that in 1939 two additional Offices had been created in the Commission, namely the Offices of Vice-President and Assistant Secretary ;

(2) that at the time of the creation of the foregoing Offices Commissioner C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.) had been unanimously elected to be Vice-President

and Commissioner James L. Peters (U.S.A.) had been similarly elected to be Assistant Secretary to the Commission.

Constitution of the Class 1946 in place of the Class 1937

6. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to report to the Congress that, in accordance with the procedure approved by the Tenth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Budapest in 1927, the Commission had, on the expiry of the term of service of the Class 1937 :—

(a) constituted the Class 1946 to replace the Class 1937 ; and had

(b) elected to the Class 1946 the zoologists who had been members of the Class so replaced, namely, Professor W. Arndt, Dr. W. T. Calman, Professor T. Esaki, Professor B. Hankó, Dr. T. Jaczewski and Dr. C. W. Stiles, subject to the confirmation of these elections at the next meeting of the Congress ;

(2) to invite the Congress to signify their approval of the action specified in (1) above.

Assumption by President Jordan of extraordinary powers on behalf of the Commission during the war 1939-1945

7. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that administrative problems of great difficulty for the Commission had followed the outbreak of war in Europe in September 1939. As Secretary to the Commission, he had himself been responsible for the safe custody of the records of the Commission, for the conduct of its financial affairs, and generally for ensuring continuity in the organisation of the Commission until the next meeting of the Congress. On the other hand, first the threat of air attack and later actual air attacks on London and other parts of the United Kingdom created a situation in which at any time either the President or the Secretary or both of these Officers might be killed or disabled and the records of the Commission destroyed. These were clearly risks which it was necessary should be guarded against, so far as possible. As Secretary to the Commission, he had therefore conferred with the President as to the course to be taken. The situation was such that effective action could at that time only be taken by officers or members of the Commission then resident in the United Kingdom, for officers and members of the Commission resident in other countries would have been unable at that time to do anything to protect the records of the Commission and very little to ensure the continued existence of the Commission in the event of the death of both the President and Secretary. The problems which had to be faced were therefore :—

(1) how to ensure that those duties in relation to the Commission and its property which at that time could only be discharged in the United Kingdom should be duly discharged in the event of the death or disablement of the President or the Secretary or of both of those officers ;

(2) how to secure the continued existence of the Commission during a war of which in 1939 it was impossible to forecast the duration, having regard to the fact that one-third of the membership of the Commission was due for renewal every three years and therefore that the entire membership of the Commission would lapse by the end of 1946 (the date of the expiry of the term of service of the Class (Class 1937) last due to be renewed).

In considering this problem, the President and the Secretary had had the benefit of the precedent set in somewhat similar circumstances at the close of the 1914–1918 war, when extraordinary powers were assumed by the then Secretary, Commissioner C. W. Stiles, who through the death of the President, was also at that time Acting President of the Commission. The action taken under the extraordinary powers then assumed by Acting President Stiles were reported to, and approved by, the Tenth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Budapest in 1927. The problems which confronted the President and Secretary of the Commission in 1939 were much more serious than those which had confronted Acting President Stiles a quarter of a century earlier, for not only were communications interrupted between the Secretariat of the Commission and certain members of the Commission, while great delays were imposed in communicating with the remaining Commissioners, but on this occasion also the Secretariat of the Commission was located in a country which, through the advent of air warfare, lay within the area of active military operations. Clearly, therefore, there was a need in 1939 for more extensive and more formal arrangements than had been called for at the end of the war of 1914–1918.

After taking the best legal advice available, he (Commissioner Hemming) had, as Secretary to the Commission, submitted a recommendation to President Jordan that he should execute a formal Instrument assuming for the duration of the emergency created by the war such extraordinary powers as he might deem to be necessary or expedient to ensure the continued existence of the Commission and to secure its due functioning after the close of the emergency, subject to the provision that as soon as might be practicable after the close of the emergency a full Report should be made to the Commission on every act taken in virtue of the extraordinary powers so assumed. This recommendation was approved by President Jordan by whom the proposed Instrument was executed on 6th September, 1939. This Instrument was styled the " Emergency Powers Declaration, 1939 " and empowered the President to issue " Directions " from time to time on such matters as that officer might deem it necessary or expedient should be regulated in this manner. The Declaration provided also (1) for the devolution to the Secretary of the functions of the President in the event of the death or disablement of the President, and (2) for the devolution to the Assistant Secretary of the functions of the Secretary in the event of the death or disablement of the Secretary or, if the Assistant Secretary was not in a position to assume those functions, upon such other member of the Commission as might temporarily assume those functions.

In making the foregoing Report on behalf of President Jordan, the Acting President asked the Commission to signify their approval of the action taken in 1939 to ensure the continued existence of the Commission through the adoption of the measures described above and to report that action to the Section on Nomenclature with a recommendation that the action be approved and confirmed. The Declaration executed by President Jordan in September, 1939, was available for inspection and the text of that Declaration was given for purposes of record in an Annex to the Report which he (Secretary Hemming) had prepared on the work of the Secretariat of the Commission in the period 1936–1948 (Commission Paper I.C.(48)2).

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note of, and approved, the action of President Jordan in assuming the extraordinary powers specified in the " Emergency Powers Declaration, 1939 " executed by him in September, 1939, for the purpose of ensuring the continued existence of the Commission during the emergency created by the outbreak of war in Europe, and of securing the due functioning of the Commission after the close of the emergency ;

(2) agreed to report to the Section on Nomenclature the action taken by President Jordan, as specified

in (1) above, with a recommendation that that action be approved and confirmed.

Constitution under the "Emergency Powers Declaration, 1939" of the Classes 1949 and 1952 in place of the Classes 1940 and 1943

8. THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note, and approved, the action of President Jordan in issuing Directions under the Emergency Powers Declaration, 1939 :—

(a) prescribing the establishment of the Classes 1949 and 1952, in place of the Classes 1940 and 1943, as from the dates on which each of the first-named Classes completed its term of service ; and

(b) directing that the six former members of the Class 1940 (Cabrera, Chapman, Hemming, Jordan, Pellegrin, Richter) should be deemed to have been elected to be members of the Class 1949 and the four former members of the Class 1943 (do Amaral, di Caporiacco, Dymond, Peters) should be deemed to have been elected to be members of the Class 1952 ;

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion* 16)

(2) confirmed the elections specified in (1) (b) above save as regards the election in 1940 of Professor Rudolf Richter (Germany) to be a member of the Class 1949, the question of the status of this election being reserved for further consideration.

Constitution of the Class 1955 in place of the Class 1946

9. THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note :—

(a) that by a postal vote undertaken in January, 1947, the Commission had constituted the Class 1955 in place of the Class 1946, the term of service of which had then expired ;

(b) that, concurrently with the action specified in (a) above, the undermentioned members of the former Class 1946 had been elected to be members of the Class 1955 :—
Professor H. BOSCHMA (Netherlands) ;
Dr. William Thomas CALMAN (United Kingdom) ;
Professor Bela HANKÓ (Hungary) ;
Dr. Norman R. STOLL (U.S.A.) ;

(c) that, concurrently with the action specified in (b) above, the Commission had decided to reserve for later consideration the

question of the re-election of the remaining members of the former Class 1946, namely:—
Professor Teiso ESAKI (Japan);
Professor Tadeusz JACZEWSKI (Poland)

(d) that no further action had been taken as regards Professor Esaki, pending a decision by the Congress in regard to the position, in relation to the membership of the Commission, of former Commissioners who were nationals of Germany or Japan;

(e) that, having regard to the fact that all efforts made to establish contact with Professor Jaczewski had proved unsuccessful, his place as a member of the Commission had been deemed to have been vacated and a successor had been elected thereto;

(2) agreed to report to the Congress the action specified in (1) above and to invite the Congress to approve and confirm the action so taken;

(3) agreed to recommend that the regulations governing the composition of the Commission should be modified expressly to provide that, if circumstances such as those referred to in (1) (e) above, were to arise in which the Commission were unable to trace the whereabouts of a member of the Commission or in which it was impossible for the Secretary to communicate with a member of the Commission or for the member of the Commission concerned to communicate with the Secretary and in consequence that member of the Commission was unable to discharge the duties of his office, the Commissioner in question should be deemed to have vacated his office as such and that his place should thereupon be filled in like manner as though he had died or had resigned, provided however that a member of the Commission shall not be deemed to have vacated his office as such when the inability of the member of the Commission concerned to communicate with the Secretary and of the Secretary to communicate with the said member of the Commission arises solely from an interruption of postal communications consequent upon the existence of a state of war between the country of which that member of the Commission is a national or in which he is normally resident and the country in which the Secretariat of the Commission is established;

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion* 16)

(4) agreed to reserve for further consideration the question of the re-election of Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) to be a member of the Commission.

Losses in the membership of the Commission since 1935 through resignations

10. THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note that, in addition to the resignation, on account of advancing years, of Commissioner Geza Horváth (Hungary) which had been reported to the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Lisbon in 1935, when, however, the vacancy so created had not been filled, the undermentioned members of the Commission had resigned from their places as such on account of age, ill-health or other causes :—
Commissioner Karl Apstein (Germany) ;
Commissioner Filippo Silvestri (Italy) ;
Commissioner Candido Bolivar y Pieltain (Spain) ;

(2) placed on record their regret at the loss, through resignation, of their colleagues named in (1) above ;

(3) agreed to report to the Congress the losses through resignation specified in (1) above.

Election of Commissioners since 1935

11. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to report to the Congress the undermentioned elections made to the membership of the Commission since the meeting in 1935 of the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology and to invite the Congress to approve and confirm the elections so made :—

(a) *Elections in* 1937 :—

Senhor Afranio do AMARAL (Brazil) *vice* Commissioner Anton Handlirsch (Austria) (deceased)
(appointed to the Class 1943) ;

Professor Bela HANKÓ (Hungary) *vice* Commissioner Geza Horváth (Hungary), (resigned)
(appointed to the Class 1937) ;

Professor Dr. Walther ARNDT (Germany) *vice* Commissioner Karl Apstein (Germany) (resigned)
(appointed to the Class 1946) ;

(b) *Elections in* 1939 :—

Professor Lodovico di CAPORIACCO (Italy) *vice* Commissioner Filippo Silvestri (Italy) (resigned)
(appointed to the Class 1943) ;

Professor J. R. DYMOND (Canada) *vice* Commissioner H. B. Fantham (Canada) (deceased) (appointed to the Class 1943);

Dr. Tadeusz JACZEWSKI (Poland) *vice* Commissioner Candido Bolivar y Pieltain (Spain) (resigned)
(appointed to the Class 1946);

(c) *Elections during the war years:—*

Professor J. Chester BRADLEY (U.S.A.) *vice* Commissioner Witmer Stone (U.S.A.) (deceased) (appointed to the Class 1952);

Professor Harold E. VOKES (U.S.A.) *vice* Commissioner Leonhard Stejneger (U.S.A.) (deceased)
(appointed to the Class 1952);

Dr. Norman R. STOLL (U.S.A.) *vice* Commissioner Charles Wardell Stiles (U.S.A.) (deceased)
(appointed to the Class 1946);

Dr. Joseph PEARSON (Australia) *vice* Commissioner Frederick Chapman (Australia) (deceased)
(appointed to the Class 1949);

(d) *Post-war elections:—*

Professor H. BOSCHMA (Netherlands) *vice* Commissioner Walther Arndt (Germany) (deceased)
(appointed to the Class 1955);

Dr. Th. MORTENSEN (Denmark) *vice* Commissioner Jacques Pellegrin (France) (deceased) (appointed to the Class 1949);

Dr. Paul RODE (France) *vice* Commissioner Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (office vacated owing to post-war circumstances)
(appointed to Class 1955).

Re-election of the President and the Secretary as from the beginning of 1941

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion 7)

12. THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note of, and approved, the action of the President in issuing in December, 1940, a Direction under the Emergency Powers Declaration, 1949, directing that the Commissioners holding respectively the offices of President of the Commission and of Secretary to the Commission should be confirmed in, and should continue to hold, the said offices when on the expiry of the term of service of the Class 1940, of which the

said Commissioners were members, they were appointed to the Class 1949 (constituted under a Direction previously issued under the Emergency Powers Declaration, 1939), unless on the close of the Emergency the Commission were to direct otherwise ;

(2) confirmed the elections specified in (1) above.

Re-election of the Assistant Secretary as from the beginning of 1944

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion* 7)

13. THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note of, and approved, the action of the President in issuing in September, 1943, a Direction under the Emergency Powers Declaration, 1939, directing that the Commissioner holding the office of Assistant Secretary should be confirmed in, and should continue to hold, the said office when on the expiry of the term of service of the Class 1943, of which the said Commissioner was a member, he was appointed to the Class 1952 (constituted under a Direction previously issued under the Emergency Powers Declaration, 1939), unless on the close of the Emergency the Commission were to direct otherwise ;

(2) confirmed the election specified in (1) above.

Election in 1945 of Assistant Secretary Peters (U.S.A.) to be Vice-President

14. THE COMMISSION :—

took note that in March, 1945, Assistant Secretary James L. Peters (U.S.A.) had been elected to be Vice-President of the Commission in the place of Vice-President Charles Wardell Stiles (U.S.A.) (deceased).

Establishment of the Class 1958 in place of the Class 1949

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

15. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that, in accordance with the decision taken by the Sixth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Berne in 1904, the term of service of the oldest-established of the three Classes of the membership of the Commission was automatically brought to a close on the day following the last day of each Congress. The Class so due for discharge on the present occasion was the Class 1949. As each Class was constituted for a period of nine years, the Class now to be constituted would be the Class 1958.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note that the Class 1949 would complete its term of service at the end of the present Congress ;

(2) agreed to recommend the Congress to constitute a new Class, to be known as the Class 1958, to take the place of the Class 1949, as from the day immediately following the last day of the present Congress.

German and Japanese representation on the Commission

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusions 8(2) *and* 9 (1) (*d*))

16. THE COMMISSION resumed their consideration of the position, in relation to the membership of the Commission, of the surviving German zoologist elected to be a Commissioner prior to the invasion of Poland by Germany in 1939 and of the Japanese zoologist elected to be a Commissioner prior to the Japanese attack on the United States in 1941.

After a full discussion, THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, having regard to the political and other conditions obtaining in Germany in the years immediately preceding the outbreak of war in Europe in 1939 and the corresponding conditions obtaining in Japan in the period immediately preceding the extension of the war to the Pacific in 1941, there could be no assurance that in the present changed conditions German and Japanese zoologists elected to be members of the Commission during those periods now commanded the confidence of the general body of zoologists in their respective countries ;

(2) that in these circumstances it was desirable to afford to zoologists in Germany and Japan respectively a fresh opportunity of expressing their wishes as to the zoologists by whom they desired respectively to be represented on the Commission ;

(3) that, in view of (1) and (2) above :—

  (a) the term of service, as a member of the Commission, of Professor Rudolf Richter (Germany) should not be deemed to have been extended beyond 31st December, 1940, the date of the expiry of the Class 1940, to which he had been elected prior to the outbreak of war in Europe ; and

  (b) the term of service, as a member of the Commission, of Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) should be deemed to have been terminated on 31st December, 1946, the date of the expiry of the Class 1946, to which he had been elected prior to the extension of the war to the Pacific ;

(4) that the Secretary to the Commission should be requested to take appropriate steps as soon as possible to ascertain the views of German and Japanese zoologists respectively on the question specified in (2) above, with a view to obtaining suggestions as to the names of zoologists who were nationals of those countries, whose election to be members of the Commission would be generally acceptable to their fellow workers;

(5) that it was to be understood that the decisions recorded in (1) to (4) above were decisions taken on grounds of principle and were not intended to reflect, and did not reflect, either upon the professional eminence of Professor Richter or of Professor Esaki or upon the value of the services rendered to the Commission by those zoologists while serving as Commissioners.

Nomination of members of the Class 1958

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion* 15)
(*Later reference: 3rd Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

17. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to nominate the undermentioned members of the former Class 1949 to be members of the Class 1958 :—

Señor Angel CABRERA (Argentina);
Mr. Francis HEMMING (United Kingdom);
Dr. Karl JORDAN (United Kingdom);
Dr. Joseph PEARSON (Australia);

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 1st Meeting, Conclusion* 4)

(2) to take note with great regret that on grounds of age and ill-health, Dr. Th. Mortensen (Denmark), a retiring member of the Class 1949, desired to be excused from further service as a member of the Commission and accordingly was not willing that his name should be put forward for nomination to the Class 1958;

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion* 4)

(3) to nominate Professor R. SPÄRCK (Denmark) to be a member of the Class 1958;

(4) to recommend the Congress to approve and confirm the foregoing nominations and to agree to leave the sixth place in the Class 1958 to be filled by the Commission after the close of the Congress.

Presidency of the Commission: request by Commissioner Karl Jordan (United Kingdom) to be excused from nomination as President for a further term

18. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that, in view of the fact that Professor Karl Jordan was a member of the Class 1949 which would complete its term of service on the day following the close of the present Congress, it was necessary for the Commission to make a nomination to the office of President for the ensuing period. It would be the wish alike of every member of the Commission and of the general body of zoologists to nominate Commissioner Jordan for a further term of service as President, an office which he had held with great distinction ever since his election thereto in 1929 in succession to the eminent Italian zoologist, the late Professor F. S. Monticelli. It was, therefore, with the greatest regret that he had to inform the Commission that he had been notified by Commissioner Jordan that owing to his age and, in particular, to his total deafness, he felt bound to ask that he should be excused from being nominated to serve as President of the Commission for a further term.

Everyone, both inside the Commission and among zoologists at large, would join in regretting the reasons which had prompted Dr. Jordan's decision. Dr. Jordan was one of the leading zoologists of the day and no man of greater professional eminence or higher personal distinction could be found to fill the office of President of the Commission. But Dr. Jordan was far more than an extremely eminent man of science. For 21 years as President, and for 35 years as a member of the Commission, Dr. Jordan had placed unreservedly at the disposal of the Commission his vast store of knowledge, his ripe experience, his mature judgment, his judicial temperament and his rich human sympathies. The office of President of the Commission was not merely a post of great dignity ; it carried with it also heavy responsibilities. First, it was the duty of the President, while giving the freest scope to all legitimate expressions of opinion, so to guide the proceedings of the Commission as to ensure continuity in its work, tempered by a due recognition of the need for adaptations to meet changing circumstances. Second, it was the duty of the President to conduct the deliberations of the Commission in such a way as to promote the highest possible degree of harmony among its members. Finally, the President of the Commission had to keep a constant watch on the needs of zoologists in matters of zoological nomenclature and on changes of opinion among zoologists in regard to these questions.

No one looking back over the history of zoological nomenclature during the inter-war years could fail to be struck by the fact that at a time when international organisations of all kinds were collapsing through internal dissensions and faulty leadership, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had not only maintained its existence but had added greatly to its moral authority and the value of the services which it rendered to the zoological profession. The major part of this success must be attributed to the wise guidance given to the Commission by its President. Only once during Dr. Jordan's long term of office was there any serious disagreement among zoologists on a question of zoological nomenclature. This was at the Congress held in 1930, and it was to the wise counsel in regard to the handling of the problem created by the controversy over the meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire" that had been given by Dr. Jordan at the next Congress that zoologists were indebted for a solution which overcame the immediate difficulties and, it might be hoped, paved the way for a generally acceptable settlement at the present Congress. These were remarkable achievements by a remarkable man. Dr. Jordan had been a great President and every member of the Commission and every member of the general body of zoologists was in his debt.

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

In the sad circumstances in which the Commission found themselves, the Commission would, no doubt, feel bound to respect Dr. Jordan's wishes and would agree, therefore, to abandon their intention of nominating him to be their President for a further term. It would be a matter of great satisfaction to every member of the Commission that, although Dr. Jordan had felt unable any longer to sustain the burden imposed by the Presidency, he had signified his willingness to serve for a further term as a private member of the Commission. All would rejoice to see his name inscribed in the list of members of the Class 1958 which had now to be established. But it was, the Acting President believed, the unanimous wish of the Commission to find some signal mark of their esteem and affection to confer upon their late President. No more appropriate recognition could be found than the submission by the Commission to the Congress of a recommendation that, as an exceptional measure, there be established an office of Honorary Life-President of the Commission and that this office be offered to Commissioner Jordan.

THE COMMISSION AGREED :—

(1) to take note with the greatest regret that Commissioner Karl Jordan (United Kingdom) felt bound on grounds of age and infirmity to ask that he be excused from being nominated to serve as President of the Commission for a further term ;

(2) to accede to Commissioner Jordan's request that he be not nominated to the vacant office of President of the Commission ;

(3) to place on record their great appreciation of the valuable services rendered both to the Commission and generally to the cause of zoological nomenclature by Commissioner Jordan during his long term of office ;

(4) to take note with great satisfaction that, notwithstanding his resignation of the office of President of the Commission, Commissioner Karl Jordan had consented to his name being included in the list of zoologists nominated to serve in the Class 1958 now about to be constituted ;

(5) to signalise the esteem and affection in which they held their late President by submitting to the Congress a recommendation that, as an exceptional measure, there be established an office of " Honorary Life-President " of the Commission and that this office be offered to Commissioner Jordan as a mark of the affection and esteem felt for him by the members of the Commission and by the general body of zoologists ;

(6) to request the Acting President to address a telegram to Commissioner Jordan, expressing their deep regret at his decision to resign the Presidency of the Commission and intimating that it was their intention to nominate him to be a member of the Commission for a further term and to invite the Congress to appoint him to the specially created office of Honorary Life-President.

Nomination of Vice-President James L. Peters (U.S.A.) to be President

19. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to nominate Vice-President James L. Peters (U.S.A.) to be President of the Commission.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) then informed the Commission that, before leaving London to attend the present Session of the Commission, he had received a letter (dated 15th July, 1948) from President Jordan expressing his regret at being unable personally to welcome his successor. In the same letter, President Jordan summed up his convictions regarding the great value of the high degree of international co-operation already established in zoological nomenclature. He (the Acting President) felt sure that the Commission would wish him to read aloud the last message addressed to them by their retiring President. The following was the text of President Jordan's letter :—

> My dear Hemming,
>
> As my deafness prevents me from attending the meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to be held in Paris during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, I am debarred from having the great pleasure personally of welcoming my successor in the Presidency of the Commission. If the choice of the Commission falls upon Vice-President James L. Peters, the Commission will have in their new President a taxonomist

of international fame in ornithology and a specialist possessing an intimate knowledge of a Class of animals and its literature, of which the nomenclature has been more intensively studied than that of any other Class of the Animal Kingdom. Vice-President Peters possesses also practical experience both of the difficulties presented by nomenclature as such and of the problems involved in meeting the diverse needs of the biological public. It is the object of the Commission both to solve those difficulties and to meet those needs, and I have no doubt that, under the guidance of the President and the Secretary, the Commission will be successful in both these tasks.

One or other of the Commissioners may at times be inclined to regret the hours spent on the consideration of nomenclatorial questions which do not directly concern his own field of study; but the thought should ever be present in our minds that Nomenclature is an International Language and the only international undertaking on the basic principle of which all biologists agree: the same name for the same animal in science throughout the globe. I know that there are highly intelligent biologists who look upon Nomenclature with disdain because the great fact has escaped them that in the present spiritual turmoil in which humanity finds itself one point of general agreement, like the basic principle of Nomenclature, renders general agreement in other matters a possibility and gives humanity some hope.

With the most cordial good wishes for a successful meeting and all kind regards to the new President and Commissioners,

Yours ever,

(*Signed*) KARL JORDAN

Nomination of Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) to be Secretary to the Commission for a further term

20. THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note that, in view of the fact that Commissioner Francis Hemming, the present holder of the office of Secretary to the Commission, was a member of the Class 1949, the term of service of which would expire on the day following the close of the present Congress, the Secretaryship of the Commission would then fall vacant and that it was therefore necessary to submit a recommendation to the Congress in regard to the filling of this office;

(2) agreed to nominate Commissioner Francis HEMMING (United Kingdom), the retiring Secretary, to be Secretary to the Commission for a further term.

Nomination of Commissioner Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) to be Vice-President

21. THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note that, on the election of Vice-President Peters to be President of the Commission, a vacancy would arise in the office of Vice-President;

(2) agreed that, having regard to the fact that the new President of the Commission would be a United States citizen and the Secretary to the Commission a European, it was desirable that the office of Vice-President should be filled by a Commissioner

who was a national of some country situated outside North America and Europe ;

(3) agreed to nominate Commissioner Afranio do AMARAL (Brazil) to be Vice-President of the Commission.

Abolition of the office of Assistant Secretary as hitherto constituted and its reconstitution as a post in the Secretariat of the Commission

22. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the great increase in the volume and complexity of the work of the Secretariat of the Commission which had occurred during the war years and had since been greatly intensified made it essential that he, the part-time and spare-time Honorary Secretary to the Commission should have a highly qualified personal assistant at his immediate disposal. When in 1947 UNESCO had given a substantial grant towards the expenses of the Commission, he had hoped that it would be possible to meet this need by engaging a whole-time salaried scientific assistant. Towards the close of 1947 an experimental appointment had been made, the officer so appointed being given the title " Assistant Scientific Director ", as the title of " Assistant Secretary " was not available, being reserved for an honorary official drawn from the membership of the Commission. It had been found however that the fact that in existing circumstances the office of Secretary to the Commission was an honorary post necessarily held by a member of the Commission as a spare-time appointment made it impossible for the Secretary to give sufficient supervision and guidance to a whole-time salaried official who inevitably worked during normal office hours, i.e. at times when the Secretary to the Commission was not available, owing to his having to earn his living in a different occupation. In order to give the Secretary as much relief as was possible, it was therefore necessary that in existing conditions he should have a spare-time assistant who could give him the help which he needed. There were serious dangers in the present arrangement by which the entire conduct of the work of the Secretariat rested upon the shoulders of a single spare-time honorary officer, as the Commission would see when they came to consider the Report by the Secretary on the work of the Secretariat of the Commission during the years 1936–1948. For the present purpose the point to be noted was that the most appropriate title for the proposed honorary spare-time assistant to the Secretary to the Commission would be that of " Assistant Secretary ". This title could not however be used for this purpose, so long as it was reserved for the title of an office tenable only by a member of the Commission in an honorary capacity. Experience had shown

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion 26*) that, during inter-Congress periods, no duties could be assigned to the office of Assistant Secretary as at present constituted and that its existence served no useful purpose. He (the Acting President) therefore proposed that the office of Assistant Secretary, as at present constituted, should be abolished, and that the title of Assistant Secretary should thus be made available for use where it was required, namely for the personal assistant to the Secretary. If at any time it were desired once more to raise to four the number of members of the Executive Committee of the Commission, this could readily be effected by the creation of a second post of Vice-President.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note of the statement by the Acting President as recorded above ;

(2) agreed to abolish the office of Assistant Secretary, as hitherto constituted and to make the title of "Assistant Secretary" available for an honorary spare-time personal assistant to the honorary (part-time and spare-time) Secretary to the Commission.

Co-operation between the Commission and Specialist Groups : Report on progress achieved since 1935

(*Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion* 8)

23. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that at their Lisbon Session the Commission had recorded their earnest hope that specialists in particular groups of the Animal Kingdom would organise themselves for the study of nomenclature. Subsequently, this resolution had, for greater emphasis, been embodied in the Commission's *Declaration* 10. He (the Acting President) was glad to be able to inform the Commission that considerable progress had been achieved in this field in the period which had elapsed since the Lisbon Session of the Commission, notwithstanding the difficulties inevitably created by the war. In the United States, no less than five specialist groups had been formed, namely (1) the American Committee on Entomological Nomenclature, which had been formed jointly by the Entomological Society of America and the American Association of Economic Entomologists, (2) the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America, established jointly by the Geological Society of America and the Paleontological Society of America, (3) the Smithsonian Institution Committee on Zoological Nomenclature, composed of taxonomists of (i) the United States National Museum, (ii) the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine of the United States Department of Agriculture, (iii) the Geological Survey of the United States, and (iv the Fish and Wild Life Service, (4) the Committee on Zoological Nomenclature of the American Museum of Natural History, and (5) the Committee on Zoological Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum. All these bodies had shown a keen desire to co-operate with the Commission and a number of interesting and valuable suggestions which had been received from these bodies would be placed before the Commission at later meetings of the present (Paris) Session. Further, within the last year there had been established in the United States a Society of Systematic Zoologists, the inaugural meeting of which he had had the pleasure of addressing at Chicago in the previous December. In Europe the more severe impact of the war had made it impossible for any progress to be achieved in this field during the years 1939–1945 but the specialist groups on the nomenclature of entomology and ornithology which had been established before the outbreak of war had succeeded in maintaining their existence and would, it was hoped, shortly be able to extend the scope of their activities. Finally, he had recently received a communication from Prague foreshadowing the establishment of a specialist group on zoological nomenclature in Czechoslovakia.

In addition to formal co-operation through the medium of organised groups, every effort had been made by himself, as Secretary to the Commission, to secure, through personal contacts and correspondence, the assistance and advice of the widest possible range of specialists. In the case of the United States and Canada these efforts had been greatly assisted by the action of Dr. Alexander Wetmore, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, in inviting him to visit America last winter for the purpose of discussing with specialists at Washington and other centres in America current problems of zoological nomenclature and, in particular, those problems which were likely to be considered at the present Congress. As a result, he had been able to hold extensive discussions, and to make large numbers of contacts, with specialists at the United States National Museum at Washington, the American Museum of Natural History at New York and the Natural History Museum at Chicago. While in Chicago he had attended the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, at which he had met specialists from many parts of the United States. Finally, at Ottawa he had had the benefit of meeting many American paleontologists at a meeting organised by the Paleontological Society of America during the annual meeting of the Geological Society of America.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note of, and approved, the action taken by the Secretary to foster co-operation on questions of zoological nomenclature between the Commission on the one hand and specialist groups and individual specialists on the other ;

(2) agreed that it was highly desirable that existing contacts should be maintained and strengthened and that additional specialist groups should be formed, wherever practicable.

***Opinions* and *Declarations* published since the meeting of the Congress held at Lisbon in 1935**

24. THE COMMISSION took note that the under-mentioned *Opinions* had been published since the last meeting of the Congress :—

(a) *Opinions* 124–133 in regard to questions decided by the Commission prior to its Session held at Lisbon in 1935 ;

(b) *Opinions* 134–181 and *Declarations* 10–12 in regard to questions decided by the Commission at its Session held at Lisbon in 1935 ;

(c) *Opinions* 182–194 in regard to questions decided by the Commission since its Session at Lisbon in 1935 ;

(d) *Declarations* 1–9 and re-issues of *Opinions* 1–16, of which the original edition was out of print and unobtainable.

The programme of the Commission for its Paris Session

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion 2*)

25. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the Commission had a very heavy programme for its present (Paris) Session. The main heads of that programme had been set out in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)1**, which had already been circulated to the members of the Commission. Broadly speaking, the field to be covered included (1) the consideration of the administrative and financial problems facing the Commission, (2) the reform of the composition of the Commission and the method of electing its members (for the purpose of securing that the Commission should become both genuinely representative and genuinely international in character), (3) the reform of the procedure of the Commission (for the purpose of ensuring that in future the Commission should be enabled to conduct its work more speedily and efficiently), (4) the problem presented by the use in the *Règles* of the expression " nomenclature binaire " (a question on which the Commission were under instructions from the last (Lisbon) Congress to submit a comprehensive report to the present meeting), (5) the amendment and clarification of the *Règles*, the insertion therein of provisions dealing with questions not at present subject to regulation, and the incorporation into the *Règles* of the interpretations of various Articles of the *Règles* given by the Commission in *Opinions* rendered at various times during the last 40 years and of provisions embodying resolutions of a general character adopted by the Commission or the Congress at various meetings held since the year 1901, when the *Règles* in their present form were adopted. It was important also that during its present Session the Commission should reach decisions on as many as possible of the applications on individual cases now awaiting attention. In addition, it would be necessary during the course of the present Congress both to seek the concurrence of the Section on Nomenclature in the changes proposed and to prepare a comprehensive report for submission to the Congress.

THE COMMISSION :—

took note of the foregoing summary of the business to be laid before them during their present (Paris) Session.

Report by the Secretary on the work of the Secretariat since the meeting of the Congress held at Lisbon in 1935

26. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, in accordance with precedent, the Secretary to the Commission would lay before the Commission a report on the work of the Secretariat since the last meeting of the Congress. On the present occasion the number of subjects to be dealt with in that report was inevitably much larger than on any previous occasion, both because—owing to the war—the exceptionally long period of 13 years had elapsed since the last meeting of the Congress and because the period to be covered by the Report was one of rapid change and development. The Report had been completed but it was inevitably a lengthy document and the Secretary had not so far been able to prepare copies for communication to the members of the Commission owing to his preoccupation with the even more urgent task of preparing papers for the consideration of the Commission on the numerous questions relating directly to zoological nomenclature on which it was desired that decisions should be taken by the Commission and by the Section on Nomenclature during the present Session. Copies of the Report would, however, be made available as soon as possible to the members of the Commission as Commission Paper I.C.(48)2.

Continuing, the Acting President said that, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, he had given in his Report a comprehensive account of the work of the Secretariat of the Commission from October, 1936, the date on which he was elected to the Secretaryship up to the eve of the present Congress, to which he had added such particulars as were available in respect of the period September, 1935, to October, 1936, during which the Secretaryship of the Commission had been vacant. The subjects dealt with in the Report included an account of :—

(1) the administrative and financial problems immediately raised by the transfer of the Secretariat of the Commission from Washington to London consequent upon the election of the present Secretary in 1936 and the arrangements made for the audit of the accounts of the Commission by a firm of Chartered Accountants;

(2) the arrangements made prior to the outbreak of war in 1939 for raising a small fund with which to make a start with the reorganisation of the Secretariat ;

(*Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 5th Meeting. Conclusion* 10)

(3) the decisions taken in regard to the reorganisation of the Secretariat of the Commission and matters allied thereto at the Plenary Conference between the President of the Commission and the Secretary to the Commission held in London on 19th June, 1939, in accordance with a decision taken by the Commission at Lisbon in 1935 ;

(4) the commencement in August, 1939, of the direct publication by the Commission of its *Opinions* and the price policy adopted in regard to the sale of the Commission's publications ;

(5) the interruption in the work of the Secretariat of the Commission consequent upon the outbreak of war in Europe in September, 1939; the arrangements then made by the Secretary to maintain contact with the members of the Commission to the full extent practicable and to ensure, so far as possible, that the work of the Commission should not be brought to a standstill if the Secretary and President were killed or disabled as the result of air attack ; the arrangements made to ensure the safety of the records of the Commission from loss by air attack or fire ;

(6) the arrangements made in 1942 for the reopening of the Secretariat and the decision to recommence the publication of *Opinions* on questions on which decisions had been taken by the Commission before the outbreak of war in 1939 ;

(7) the establishment in May, 1943, of the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature " as the Official Organ of the Commission for the publication of applications

received by the Commission, in order to provide zoologists with full information regarding matters under consideration by the Commission ;

(8) the issue in July, 1943, of an Appeal for a Fund of £1,800 to enable the Commission to clear off the most urgent of its arrears of printing ;

(9) the decision in 1943 to publish as soon as possible an authoritative edition of the substantive French text of the *Règles* together with a literal English translation ;

(10) the decision in 1943 to issue the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " in book form with full bibliographical data ;

(11) the decision in 1943 to embody in *Declarations* certain important resolutions adopted at various times by the Commission and the Congress which had been largely overlooked through never having been published elsewhere than in the Proceedings of the Congresses concerned ; the decision to begin the re-publication (announced in 1939) of the older *Opinions* which were out of print and unobtainable ;

(12) the decision in 1943 to complete *Opinions* on questions on which voting had begun prior to the outbreak of war in 1939 but on which the required number of votes had not been received by that time ;

(13) the decision in 1943 to devote the whole of Volume 2 of " Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature " to the *Opinions* and *Declarations* adopted by the Commission at Lisbon in 1935 and to commence the concurrent publication of Volume 3 of the same work for *Opinions* adopted by the Commission after their Lisbon meeting ;

(14) the rapid growth from 1943 onwards in the number of applications submitted annually to the Commission and in the volume of correspondence handled annually in the Secretariat ;

(15) the changes introduced during the war in the method of electing members of the Commission ;

(16) the decision in 1946 to establish a corporation to hold the assets of the Commission and to enter into contractual obligations on its behalf ; the establishment for this purpose in February, 1947, of a corporation formed under United Kingdom law with the title " International Trust for Zoological

Nomenclature " ; the acceptance of the Chairmanship of the Trust by the former British Cabinet Minister, the Right Hon. Walter Elliot ;

(17) the offer to the Commission by UNESCO in April, 1947, to make, subject to certain conditions, a grant not exceeding $10,936 for the year 1947 and a similar grant not exceeding $10,600 for the year 1948 ;

(18) the visit to the United States and Canada paid by the Secretary to the Commission in December, 1947, on the invitation of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., for the purpose of discussing problems of zoological nomenclature, in particular those to be considered at the Paris Meeting of the International Congress of Zoology ;

(19) the administrative problems involved in organising an office dealing with a large volume of work and employing a whole-time salaried staff supervised by an honorary spare-time (and part-time) Head.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note of the summary given by the Acting President, as indicated above, of the Report on the work of the Secretariat of the Commission during the period 1935–1948, which he had prepared, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission (Commission Paper I.C.(48)2), and approved the action so taken ;

(2) agreed to recommend that the Report referred to in (1) above should be submitted to the Congress.

Thanks of the Commission to the Right Hon. Walter Elliot for accepting the Chairmanship of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

27. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to invite the Acting President to send a telegram in their name expressing their thanks to the Right Honourable Walter Elliot, M.P., F.R.S., for having consented to accept the Chairmanship of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature.

Thanks of the Commission to the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

28. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to invite the Acting President to convey to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., an expression of their thanks for the invitation extended to the Secretary to the Commission to visit Washington and other centres in North America in December, 1947, for the purpose of discussing problems of zoological nomenclature with American zoologists in preparation for the Session of the Commission to be held in Paris during the present Congress.

Thanks of the Commission for donations received

29. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to place on record their grateful thanks to all Government Agencies, Museums and other Scientific Institutions, Learned Societies and individual zoologists and paleontologists in all parts of the world who, during the period 1938–1948, had assisted the work of the Commission by making donations to its funds.

Thanks of the Commission to UNESCO

30. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to place on record their warm appreciation of the interest in, and the understanding of the needs of, their work shown by UNESCO and their most grateful thanks for the munificent subvention made to their funds by UNESCO in the year 1947 and for the continuation of that support in the year 1948 ;

(2) to invite the Acting President to convey the foregoing resolution to UNESCO on behalf of the Commission.

Preliminary report on the work of the Commission during its first and second meetings to be submitted orally to the Section on Nomenclature as soon as possible

31. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to invite the Acting President to take an early opportunity :—

(a) to submit a report orally to the Section on Nomenclature :—

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 1st Meeting, Conclusions* 1-7)

(i) on the matters recorded in the Conclusions of the First Meeting of the Commission during its present Session in regard to the attendance of members of the Commission at the present Session, the election of Alternate Members of the Commission for the duration of the present Session, and the throwing open of the meetings of the Commission to all members of the Congress ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusions* 1-30)

(ii) on the matters discussed at the Second Meeting of the Commission during its present Session in regard to the business to be dealt with during the present Session, the changes in the membership of the Commission, in the Offices of the Commission and in the holders of those offices which had occurred since 1935, the exceptional measures taken during the war to secure continuity in the work of the Commission and to preserve the records of the Commission from destruction, the action proposed to be taken to afford to German and Japanese zoologists a fresh opportunity to indicate by whom they desire to be represented on the Commission, the establishment of the new Class 1958 in the membership of the Commission and the nominations of zoologists for election thereto, the resignation of President Karl Jordan and the nomination of Vice President James L. Peters in his place, the nomination of Commissioner A. do Amaral to be Vice-President, the proposed re-election of Commissioner Francis Hemming to be Secretary to the Commission, the proposed change in the status of the office of Assistant Secretary, the action taken since 1935 to promote co-operation between the Commission and specialist groups established for the study of particular aspects of zoological nomenclature, the publication of *Opinions* and *Declarations* since 1935, the Report by the Secretary on the work of the Secretariat in the period 1936–1948, the resolutions of thanks to the Right Hon. Walter Elliot for accepting the Chairmanship of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, to the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., for inviting the Secretary to the Commission to visit America in December in 1947 for the purpose of discussing current problems of zoological nomenclature, to institutions and individuals in all parts of the world for making donations to the funds of the Commission, and finally the resolution of appreciation and thanks to UNESCO for the munificent subvention made to the funds of the Commission in 1947 and for its renewal in 1948 ;

(b) to invite the Section on Nomenclature :

(i) to take note of the matters reported under (a) above ;

(ii) to signify their approval of the action taken by, or, as respects action taken during the war 1939–1945, on behalf of the Commission, in the case of those matters which require such approval ;

(iii) to approve the recommendations submitted by the Commission as regards certain action now proposed to be taken ;

(iv) to recommend the Congress to approve and confirm the action taken by the Commission as respects the matters referred to in (ii) and (iii) above ;

(v) to submit to the Congress the Report on the work of the Secretariat of the Commission during the period 1936–1948 prepared by the Secretary to the Commission (Commission Paper **I.C.(48)2).**

Preliminary reports on the work of the Commission at its third and subsequent meetings to be submitted to the Section on Nomenclature as soon as practicable after the close of those meetings

32. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, in order to give the Section on Nomenclature the fullest opportunity for considering matters on which the Commission wished to submit recommendations, it was desirable to abandon the practice followed by the Commission at former meetings of the Congress under which the recommendations formulated by the Commission were submitted *en bloc* in the Report prepared by the Commission for submission to, and approval by, the Congress, at a joint meeting of the Section and the Commission held near the close of the Congress, and in its place to adopt a procedure which would secure that recommendations formulated by the Commission were submitted to the Section at the earliest possible moment after they had been agreed upon by the Commission ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session. 1st Meeting. Conclusion 7*)

(*Later reference: Paris Session. 11th Meeting. Conclusion 5*)

(2) in pursuance of the policy laid down in (1) above to invite the Acting President, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, to take the first practicable opportunity after the close of their third and subsequent meetings during the present Session, where those meetings were not themselves meetings held jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, to submit orally to the Section the recommendations agreed upon by the Commission on the basis of the documents submitted to the Commission and the Section as Commission Papers of the I.C.(48) Series or otherwise, thereby enabling the Section to reach conclusions thereon in advance of the submission for their consideration of the draft of the Report to be submitted by the Commission to the Congress.

Arrangements for the preparation of the Report to be submitted to the Congress

33. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the Report to be submitted by the Commission to the Congress should include references to the more important of the matters taken note of, or agreed upon, as the case might be, during the first and second meetings of the Commission during its present Session ;

(2) to invite the Acting President to commence the preparation of the drafts of the paragraphs dealing with the matters referred to in (1) above to be included in the Report to be submitted by the Commission to the Congress.

Composition of the Commission and the method of nominating its members

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusions* 1-11)

34. THE COMMISSION had before them a memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission (Commission Paper **I.C.(48)3)** on the composition of the Commission and the method of nominating its members. After giving a historical sketch of the developments which had occurred in these matters at various times since the establishment of the Commission, this paper set out a number of recommendations submitted by the Executive Committee of the Commission in regard to various allied, but distinct, aspects of the problem involved in securing for the Commission a more genuinely representative and international character than it at present possessed.

In the preliminary discussion which ensued, the view was expressed that the time had come when changes should be made on the lines suggested by the Executive Committee. Care would need to be taken, however, to ensure that these changes did not hamper the Commission's freedom of choice in selecting zoologists to be members of the Commission or otherwise impair the efficiency of its work.

At this point, the Acting President recalled that at 1645 hours the Municipality of Paris was giving a reception at the Hôtel de Ville to the foreign members of the Congress. As many of the members of the Commission no doubt wished to attend this function, he accordingly proposed that the present meeting should be brought to a close and that at their next meeting the Commission should resume consideration of the proposals now before them.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to postpone to their next meeting the further consideration of the proposals relating to the composition of the Commission and the method of nominating its members submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)3.

Place of meetings of the Commission during its Paris Session

35. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) informed the Commission that he had been notified by the Secretary-General of the Congress that the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard, where they were now meeting, had been placed at the exclusive disposal of the Section on Nomenclature for the remainder of the Congress. As President of the Section, he (the Acting President of the Commission) proposed to call meetings of the Section at times which would be convenient to those zoologists who had notified him of their desire to make communications to the Section and which at the same time would not conflict with the meetings of the Commission. Thus, the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard would be available for the remainder of the Congress as the meeting place of the Commission.

THE COMMISSION :—

took note that for the remainder of the present (Paris) Session all their meetings would be held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard.

Third and Fourth meetings of the Commission during its Paris Session : dates and times appointed

36. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the Third Meeting of their Paris Session should be held on the evening of the same day at 2030 hours ;

(2) that the Fourth Meeting of their Paris Session should be held at 0900 hours on the morning of the following day, Thursday, 22nd July, 1948.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned at* 1640 *hours.*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology,
Paris, 21st–27th July, 1948

CONCLUSIONS of the Third Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Wednesday, 21st July, 1948 at 2030 hours

PRESENT:

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present:
Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (U.S.A.)
Professor Kamel Mansour (Egypt)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*
Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer*

The size of the Commission and the nature of its composition

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion.* 34)

1. THE COMMISSION resumed their consideration of the recommendation submitted by the Executive Committee in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)3** for the removal of the present upper limit to the membership of the Commission. This proposal was put forward on two grounds: (1) to make it possible for the zoologists of any country in which any considerable body of zoological work was being conducted to be afforded direct representation on the Commission; (2) to secure that in other respects also the composition of the Commission was such that it was thoroughly representative both of the various types of knowledge and experience requisite for the work of the Commission and also of the needs of the various classes of workers (both systematic and other) who were concerned with zoological nomenclature. In the same paper the Executive Committee had made it clear that, if changes were to be made in the composition of the Commission on the lines which they recommended, it would, in their view, be essential also that certain changes should be made simultaneously in the rules of procedure of the Commission. Recommendations by the Executive Committee on this latter subject had been submitted to the Commission in Commission Paper I.C.(48)4.

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusions* 4-10)

The following points were made in the course of the ensuing discussion:—

(a) There was clearly a desire among the zoologists of a number of countries to be given an opportunity of being directly represented on the Commission. Subject to appropriate safeguards and, in particular, to the simultaneous introduction of consequential changes in procedure, such an increase in the size of the membership would be a source of strength to the Commission, for it would make the Commission both more representative and also more genuinely international in character. Further, it would provide a means of diffusing knowledge of the *Règles* and therefore of promoting their more general application in countries which under the existing system were not directly represented on the Commission.

(b) If the zoologists of any given country were to be afforded representation on the Commission, it was most desirable that any zoologist elected to be their representative on it should not only possess the personal qualities requisite to make him an efficient member of the Commission but should also occupy a position in his own country which would make him generally acceptable to his fellow-workers as their representative.

(c) If the Commission was to continue to act effectively as a corporate body, it was very important that it should retain, both on its own behalf and on that of the Congress, a sufficient degree of control over the selection of persons to be elected as Commissioners. It would be most unfortunate if a situation were to be allowed to develop in which the Commission consisted solely of persons selected by national groups of zoologists and acting solely as the representatives of those groups. It was most important that in the future, as in the past, members of the Commission, while taking due account of views expressed by zoologists who were fellow-countrymen of theirs, should nevertheless approach their duties in a spirit of independence and impartiality.

(d) It was essential that the scheme now to be adopted should be such as would not only provide for the adequate representation of zoologists of particular countries but would also enable the Commission to call to its membership any outstanding zoologist who, they might consider, could assist them in their work, irrespective of whether that zoologist was a national of a country which was represented on the Commission. Similarly, the Commission should be free to invite an outstanding specialist to be a member of the Commission where that specialist was a national of a country already represented on the Commission but had not been nominated by the zoologists of his own country to be their representative. In the modern world there were also many eminent men who were forced by circumstances to live in exile or who through force of circumstances had become stateless. It would be wrong if the Commission were to be debarred from calling to their counsels zoologists so placed.

(e) It was important also to ensure the continuance in the future of the policy followed in the past of securing an appropriate balance in the membership of the Commission as between :—

  (i) the representation of zoologists of one part of the world and those of another ;
  (ii) specialists in one part of the Animal Kingdom and those of another ;
  (iii) the interests of systematic zoology on the one hand and those of the applied biological sciences (such as medicine, agriculture, veterinary science, horticulture, etc.) on the other ;
  (iv) specialists in living forms and paleozoologists.

The COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(Later references: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusions 5-9 ; *12th Meeting, Conclusion 15*)

(1) that, subject to the simultaneous adoption of appropriate changes in the Commission's rules of procedure, the Commission should cease to be a body with a fixed membership of 18 Commissioners and that in lieu of this system there should in future be set a minimum membership of 18 but that there should be no maximum upper limit to the membership ;

(2) that, so far as is practicable, the composition of the Commission should be such as to secure :—

  (a) that zoologists in any country in which any considerably body of zoological work was being conducted should have an opportunity of being directly represented on the Commission ;
  (b) that there should be an appropriate equilibrium in the representation on the Commission of zoologists of one part of the world and those of other parts of the world ;

(c) that the membership of the Commission should include specialists in the principal divisions of the Animal Kingdom ;

(d) that the membership of the Commission should include an appropriate representation of specialists in paleozoology ;

(e) that there should be an adequate representation in the membership of the Commission not only of the needs and wishes of workers in systematic zoology but also of those of workers in the applied biological sciences (e.g., medicine, agriculture, veterinary science, horticulture, etc.), who, as the users of zoological names, were directly interested in the problems of zoological nomenclature ;

(3) that, in order to give effect to recommendation (2) (a) above, the Commission should be authorised to elect to its membership a specialist or specialists to represent zoologists or workers in the applied biological sciences who were nationals of any country which at the time in question was either unrepresented on the Commission or for which the existing representation was, in the opinion of the Commission, inadequate, provided that, in the former case, the Commission were satisfied that a considerable body of zoological work was being conducted in the country concerned ;

(4) that, in order to give effect to recommendations (2) (b) to (2) (e) above, the Commission should be authorised on its own motion to invite individual specialists to be members of the Commission, irrespective of the nationality of the specialists concerned.

Method to be followed in the nomination and election of members of the Commission

2. THE COMMISSION then turned to consider the recommendations in regard to the method to be followed in the nomination and election of members of the Commission submitted by the Executive Committee in Commission Paper I.C.(48)3.

The following points were made in the course of the ensuing discussion :—

(a) It was necessary that the scheme to be adopted should distinguish between the method to be followed in nominating candidates for election to the Commission :—

(i) where it was desired that the zoologist in question, when elected, should act also as the representative of the zoologists of the country of which he was a national;

(ii) where it was not desired that the zoologist in question, when elected, should be the representative of a national group of zoologists, but where the Commission itself desired to call the zoologist in question to its membership by reason of his possessing special knowledge or experience which, in the opinion of the Commission, would be of value to their work.

(b) There were wide differences in the way in which zoologists were organised in different countries. It was important, therefore, that the rules to be made for the selection of the type of body to be consulted for the purpose of ascertaining the views of the zoologists of any given country on the question of the selection of a representative to serve on the Commission should be sufficiently elastic to provide for the differences in the conditions obtaining in one country as compared with another. This was a matter of great importance, for a channel of consultation which would be an appropriate, and, in some cases, the only appropriate, channel for one country would be inappropriate or totally impracticable in the case of another country.

(c) It was desirable that, so far as might be found practicable, consultations in regard to the nomination of zoologists to be representative members of the Commission should be conducted through important bodies in close touch with zoological work or with work in applied zoology in the country concerned (such as leading Museums, scientific institutions and learned societies) rather than through bodies which, though of high status, were in less close touch with current work (such as National Academies of Science, Government Departments, etc.).

(d) The fact that, under the new system, some of the members of the Commission would represent the zoologists of the countries of which they were nationals must not be allowed to create a situation in which the members concerned regarded themselves solely or principally as the delegates of the zoologists of their respective countries. It was essential to maintain the principle that, when the Commission was considering any application submitted to it for decision, it should approach its duty objectively in a strictly judicial spirit, each Commissioner examining impartially the evidence submitted and recording his vote in the light solely of that evidence and of the relevant considerations involved thereby.

(e) The adoption of the representative principle must not be carried to a point at which the Commission would lose control over the selection of persons to be elected as Commissioners, for it would not always happen that the consultative method would provide candidates possessed both of high professional distinction and of the personal qualities requisite to make an efficient member of the Commission.

At the close of the discussion, THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 15)

(1) that every application for the election of a member of the Commission to be the representative of the zoologists of a particular country not at that time represented on the Commission or, where the zoologists of a country were so represented, for the election of an additional representative or representatives, should be submitted to the Commission either by some leading scientific institution or learned society of that country or by the National Academy of Science of that country or by a Government Agency of that country or through that country's diplomatic representative in the country in which the headquarters of the Commission were situated, and that no application submitted otherwise than as specified above should be taken into consideration ;

(2) that every application received by the Commission for the election of a member of the Commission to represent the zoologists of a given country should be referred forthwith to the Executive Committee of the Commission, whose duty it should be to satisfy itself, on behalf of the Congress :—

  (a) that the body signatory to the application was adequately representative of the zoologists of the country concerned ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion* 1 (3))

  (b) that, having regard to the conditions proposed to be attached to the election of members of the Commission to represent zoologists of particular countries, there were grounds which would justify the election of such a member or, where the zoologists of the country concerned were already represented on the Commission, of an additional representative ;

(c) that the candidate proposed for election was personally possessed of the technical knowledge, experience, energy and other qualifications requisite for the performance of the duties of a member of the Commission ;

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion 1(2))

(d) that the proposed election would not conflict with the principle already agreed upon that a due balance of geographical or other qualifications shall be maintained in the membership of the Commission ;

(3) that, where the Executive Committee were satisfied on all the matters specified in (2) above, they should thereupon elect the proposed candidate to be a member of the Commission ;

(4) that, where the Executive Committee were satisfied in regard to the matters specified in (a), (b) and (c) of (2) above but not in regard to the matter specified in (d) of (2) above, they should nevertheless be free to elect the proposed candidate to be a member of the Commission, provided that at the same time they elected also another zoologist to be a member, or other zoologists to be members of the Commission, in order to maintain the required balance of geographical and other qualifications in the membership of the Commission ;

(5) that, where the Executive Committee were not satisfied in regard to all the matters specified in (a), (b) and (c) of (2) above, they should refuse to elect the candidate proposed ;

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion 1(4))

(6) that the Executive Committee should be free at any time to elect any zoologist to be a member of the Commission, irrespective of his nationality, where they were satisfied that, by reason of the special knowledge and experience possessed by the zoologist in question, his election would be of value to the work of the Commission ;

(7) that, where, through death, resignation or removal, a vacancy arises in the membership of the Commission, the Executive Committee should either itself nominate a zoologist to fill the said vacancy or should invite the authority or authorities specified in (1) above as the case may be, to submit the name of a candidate to fill the said vacancy ;

(8) that, where the Executive Committee invite an authority or authorities in a given country to submit the name of a candidate to fill a vacancy in the Commission arising from any of the causes specified

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion* 2(2) (*c*))

in (7) above, the Committee, on receiving such a nomination, shall satisfy themselves regarding the personal qualifications of the candidate proposed in like manner as that to be followed in cases where they receive an application for the election of a zoologist to be a member of the Commission to represent the zoologists of some country not at that time represented on the Commission ;

(9) that immediately upon the Executive Committee electing a zoologist to be a member of the Commission, the said election shall be promulgated in the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature ".

Arrangements to be made for Commissioners periodically to submit themselves to re-election

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 15)

3. THE COMMISSION considered next the conditions under which the members of the Commission were required periodically to offer themselves for re-election and in this connection had before them the recommendations submitted by the Executive Committee in Commission Paper I.C.(48)3 (paragraph 2 (8)). Ever since the meeting of the Congress held in Berne in 1904, each member of the Commission had been elected for a period of nine years, one of the three Classes into which the membership of the Commission was divided being renewed at each meeting of the Congress. This system had worked satisfactorily, so long as the Congress had continued to meet regularly at intervals of three years, but had been thrown out of gear by the war of 1914–18. From that time onwards the Commission itself had had to take over from the Congress the duty of renewing one Class at the end of each three-year period (calculated from 1903, the year as from which the system had been in operation), subject, in the case of years in which the Congress met, to the term of service of the Class having the longest service being brought to a close, irrespective of whether it had completed its full nine-year term. As pointed out in the paper circulated, still further adjustments would need to be made if the Class system were to be retained, for, now that the Commission was no longer to have a fixed membership, the total number of members at any given time would not necessarily be divisible by three.

In the discussion which ensued it was generally agreed that it was essential to maintain the principle that members of the Commission should be required periodically to offer themselves for re-election. On the other hand, it was felt that now that the Congress no longer met at regular three-yearly intervals, the system by which one Class was renewed every three years had outlived its usefulness. It would be better to introduce a simpler scheme by which the term of service of one-third of the members of the Commission was brought to a close at each meeting of the Congress, irrespective of the intervals between successive meetings of the Congress.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that the present system under which the membership of the Commission was divided into three Classes, the term of service of the Class having the longest service being terminated at the end of every third year calculated from the year 1903 or at the meeting of each successive Congress, whichever was the earlier, should be abolished and that the following system be instituted in its place :—

(a) For the purpose of determining the order in which each member of the Commission is to complete his term of service as such, there shall be established a list in which the names of the members of the Commission are to be inscribed in the order in which each was elected to be a member of the Commission.

(b) A Commissioner who has been elected for a second or greater number of terms of service is to take precedence for the purpose of (a) above as from the date on which he was last elected a member of the Commission.

(c) Where, on their first election, two or more zoologists are elected to be Commissioners on the same day, their names shall be placed in alphabetical order on the list referred to in (a) above, but where two or more Commissioners are re-elected on the same day for a further term of service, they shall retain in relation to one another their former relative seniority.

(d) At each meeting of the Congress the term of service shall be terminated of one-third of the total membership of the Commission or, if that number is not a whole number, the next highest whole number, the Commissioners whose term of service is to be so brought to a close being those who have served the longest since being elected a member of the Commission or since having last been so re-elected as the case may be.

(2) that the four members of the Class 1949, which would complete its term of service on the day

(*Previous reference: Paris Session. 2nd Meeting, Conclusion* 17)

following the last day of the present (Paris) Congress, namely, Commissioners Cabrera (Argentina), Hemming (United Kingdom), Jordan (United Kingdom) and Pearson (Australia), whom at the meeting noted in the margin it had been agreed to nominate to the new Class 1958, and Professor R. Spärck (Denmark) who at the same meeting it had been agreed should be nominated to the same Class, should under the new system recommended under (1) above, be, in the case of the first four of the zoologists concerned, re-elected and, in the case of Professor Spärck, elected to be members of the Commission for a term of service commencing on the day following the close of the present Congress.

Grant of leave of absence to, and removal of, Commissioners in certain circumstances

(*Previous reference: Paris Session. 2nd Meeting, Conclusion* 5)

4. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that in 1939 the Commission had agreed to create two additional posts of officer (Vice-President and Assistant Secretary) and that in consequence a need for the revision of the By-Laws had arisen. The outbreak of war in that year had made it impossible to go far with this revision, but at the end of the war he, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, had taken up this matter again, by correspondence, with the members of the Commission. He had found that it would be impracticable to confine the proposed revision of the By-Laws to the points that he had noted in 1939, for the existing text, which had remained virtually unchanged since its adoption by the Commission at their session held during the meeting of the Eighth International Congress of Zoology at Graz in 1910, was incomplete and thoroughly obsolete, containing, for example, no reference to the additional powers conferred upon the Commission by the Ninth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Monaco in 1913 (in relation to the suspension of the *Règles* in certain cases) or to the additional duties imposed upon the Commission by the same Congress (in connection with the compilation and maintenance of the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology "). The provisions in the By-Laws relating to the procedure of the Commission had been thoroughly inadequate even at the time when those By-Laws were adopted at Graz, and had been rendered obsolete three years later by the decisions taken by the Monaco (1913) Congress in regard to the procedure to be followed by the Commission when dealing with cases involving the use of their plenary powers. It had been evident, therefore, that the By-Laws required a thorough and far-reaching revision. It had appeared to him (as the

Secretary to the Commission) that advantage of the opportunity presented by the need for the revision of the By-Laws should be taken to secure other much needed reforms, subject, where necessary, to the subsequent approval of the Congress. These reforms included the adoption of provisions (1) for the removal of Commissioners who, by being cut off from postal communication with the headquarters of the Commission, were unable to perform their duties as Commissioners, and (2) for the repeal of the obsolete and undemocratic *Liberum Veto* in cases relating to proposed amendments of the *Règles*, which, in a moment of lack of confidence, the Commission at Graz in 1910 had gratuitously imposed upon themselves to the great detriment of the efficiency of the Commission as an organisation. On the first of these questions the Commission during its present Session had agreed upon a recommendation to be submitted to the Congress, while, on the second, a recommendation was included in paragraph 6 (1) of the paper (Commission Paper I.C.(48)4) now before the Commission and would be considered later during the present meeting. Other reforms which had been considered in 1945 were (a) the inclusion in the By-Laws of a compulsory age-limit for the retirement of Commissioners and (b) the adoption of a provision that any Commissioner who over a specified period consistently failed to perform his duties as such should automatically be removed from his membership of the Commission. The first of these provisions was within the powers of the Commission to enforce, but the enactment of the second required the approval of the Congress. The point was of some practical importance, for there had been several occasions when the effective voting strength of the Commission had been unnecessarily impaired through the lack of powers to remove a Commissioner who on account of old age, ill-health or other reasons consistently failed to discharge the duties of his office. It was proposed that the Congress should now be asked to approve a provision under which any Commissioner who failed on five successive occasions to record his vote on a proposed *Opinion* or *Declaration* would be liable to have his name removed by the Executive Committee from the list of members of the Commission, save where, within a specified period, the Commissioner in question furnished to the Committee an explanation which they accepted as sufficient. A member of the Commission might be unable to discharge his duties for a year if he were granted a Sabbatical Year for the purpose, for example, of taking part in some scientific expedition. In such a case, the Commission should have power to appoint a temporary substitute member to act for the Commissioner granted leave in this way. Where,

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion* 9(3))

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion* 6) however, a Commissioner either failed to furnish any excuse or furnished an explanation not regarded as satisfactory by the Executive Committee, his place should immediately be filled. It was desirable also to take the present opportunity to ask the Congress to approve a provision for the automatic removal of a Commissioner when found to be suffering from any of the disqualifications specified, in relation to members of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, in Article 41 of the Articles of Association of that corporation. The disqualifications, which were of a common form nature, arose when a member (1) was convicted in a Court of Law and sentenced to a term of imprisonment, (2) became bankrupt, or (3) was found lunatic or became insane. There should also be provision for a member of the Commission to vacate his office by giving notice in writing that he had resigned his membership of the Commission. The present By-Laws contained no provision on this subject, and much time had been wasted in the past in such cases while the Commission debated (by correspondence) whether a resignation received from a Commissioner should be accepted.

In the ensuing discussion there was general agreement regarding the need for provisions of the kind outlined above. The view was expressed also that the power to remove a Commissioner who failed to vote on a number of successive occasions would be valuable not only as providing a means for keeping up the voting strength of the Commission but also as a means for eliminating from the membership of the Commission persons who might have been nominated to be representative members without having any real interest in zoological nomenclature, for such persons would almost certainly become liable to removal from the Commission under this provision.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that the regulations governing the membership of the Commission should contain the following provisions for the grant of leave of absence to members of the Commission and for the removal of Commissioners from their office on incurring any of the disqualifications specified below :—
>
> (a) Where a member of the Commission notifies the Secretary to the Commission that he will be unable to perform his duties as a Commissioner for a specified future period by reason, for example, of taking part in a scientific expedition, the Secretary shall immediately report the receipt of this communication to the

Executive Committee who may thereupon grant leave of absence to the Commissioner concerned for a specified period and may appoint in his place a substitute to act as an Alternate Member of the Commission, who, while so officiating, shall possess all the rights, privileges, duties and obligations prescribed for an Alternate Member appointed to serve as such during a session of the Commission held during a meeting of the Congress.

(b) Where a member of the Commission, not being a member to whom leave of absence has been granted in accordance with the provisions of (a) above, fails on five successive occasions to record his vote on a proposed *Declaration* or a proposed *Opinion*, the name of that member shall be removed from the list of members of the Commission on the expiry of a period of three calendar months calculated from the date of the last such failure, unless in the meanwhile the Commissioner concerned has furnished to the Secretary an explanation in writing and the Executive Committee, on considering that explanation, directs that the name of the Commissioner in question be not removed from the list of members of the Commission.

(c) The office of a member of the Commission shall be vacated :—

- (i) if, on conviction in a Court of Law, other than a Court established in time of war by an Occupying Power, he is sentenced to a term of imprisonment ;
- (ii) if he becomes bankrupt ;
- (iii) if he is found lunatic or becomes insane ;
- (iv) if by notice in writing he resigns his membership of the Commission.

Reform of the rules of procedure of the Commission

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion 1)

5. THE COMMISSION had before them a memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission (Commission Paper **I.C.(48)4**) relating to the need for introducing reforms in the procedure of the Commission in order both to adjust that procedure to meet the situation created by the proposed increase in the size of the Commission and also to ensure that in the future the Commission should be in a position to discharge its duties with promptness and efficiency. The paper submitted to the Commission contained proposals under both these heads which had been formulated by the Executive Committee for the consideration of the Commission.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

> to consider separately each of the principal issues raised in regard to the procedure of the Commission in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)4**.

Reform of the voting procedure of the Commission

(*Previous reference: Paris Session. 3rd Meeting. Conclusion* 1)

6. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the proposals for the reform of their voting procedure submitted by the Executive Committee in Commission Paper I.C.(48)4 and summarised in paragraph 6 (1) of that paper. In this connection the Commission recalled that they had already agreed in principle that, if for no other reason, certain changes in their voting procedure were necessary in view of the decision to increase the size of the Commission.

The discussion of these proposals showed that there was general agreement as to the need (1) for the abolition of the obsolete *Liberum Veto* (than which no single provision had attracted greater criticism against the Commission), and (2) for calculating the voting in any given case by the relation of the number of affirmative votes cast to the total number of votes cast and not to the total number of possible votes. It was felt, however, that it would be desirable to require that a minimum number of votes should be cast before any proposed *Opinion* or *Declaration* was adopted as the *Opinion* of, or as a *Declaration* by, the Commission.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that both at meetings of the Commission and, when during intervals between such meetings, decisions need to be taken by the Commission either in regard to the interpretation or possible amendment of the *Règles* or in regard to the application of the *Règles* in individual cases :—
>
> (a) A proposed *Opinion* not involving the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to suspend the *Règles* shall be adopted as the *Opinion* of the whole Commission when all the members of the Commission have voted thereon or when, after a period of six months calculated from the date of despatch by the Secretary to the Commission of voting papers in regard to the proposed *Opinion*, not less than one-fourth of the total number of members of the Commission, calculated by reference to the number of such members as at the date on which the voting papers were so despatched, record their votes on the said proposal or, without voting,

signify their willingness to support the view, or the majority view, of other members of the Commission, provided that, where the voting is not unanimous, the number of affirmative votes, including any conditionally affirmative votes cast in the manner indicated above, exceeds the number of negative votes cast.

(b) A proposed *Opinion* involving the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to suspend the *Règles* or a proposed *Declaration* containing a recommendation to the International Congress of Zoology in favour of any change in, or addition to, the *Règles* shall be adopted as the *Opinion* or *Declaration* of the whole Commission in like conditions to those specified in (a) above, save that every such proposed *Opinion* or *Declaration* shall require to receive at least two affirmative votes, including affirmative votes conditionally cast in the manner indicated in (a) above, out of every three votes cast, in order to secure its adoption by the Commission.

Plenary powers resolution : proposed amendment and incorporation in the "Règles"

7. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the proposals in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)4** for the amendment of the Resolution adopted by the Ninth International Congress of Zoology at Monaco in 1913, under which plenary powers to suspend the *Règles* in certain circumstances were conferred upon the Commission, and for the incorporation in the *Règles* of an Article setting out the foregoing resolution as amended.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) informed the Commission that, in his capacity of President of the Section on Nomenclature, he had received notice from Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) of his intention of laying before the Section two proposals for the amendment of the *Règles*, for which wide support had been given by Scandinavian zoologists (file Z.N.(S.)359). The first of these proposals dealt in part with the amendment of the Plenary Powers Resolution. It would be a great convenience if the Commission would consider the proposals submitted by Dr. Lemche concurrently with the proposals submitted in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)4**, for it would then be possible for him to indicate to the Section the opinion of the Commission when Dr. Lemche made his communication to the Section, which it had been arranged that he should do at a joint meeting of the Section and the Commission to be held on the morning of the next day but one (Friday, 23rd July).

The discussion which followed showed that there was general agreement with the proposals for the amendment of the Plenary Powers Resolution as summarised in paragraph 6 (2) of Commission Paper I.C.(48)4. The following additional points were raised :—

(a) *Final character of decisions taken by the Commission under their plenary powers:*

(*Previous references: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusions 1 and 5*)

In view of the decisions which had been taken to enlarge the size of the Commission and to liberalise its voting procedure, Article 2 of the Plenary Powers Resolution (*Declaration* 5) (which dealt with the setting-up of a Board of Three to consider applications for the suspension of the *Règles* where the Commission was not unanimously in favour of the proposal but two-thirds of its members had voted in favour of that course) was no longer appropriate and should, as suggested in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)4**, now be deleted. It was felt, however, that it was desirable that there should be inserted at some appropriate point in the revised text a sentence embodying the proposition laid down in the last sentence of that Article, namely that a decision taken by the Commission under its plenary powers was final and not subject to appeal.

(b) *Period of notice to be given:*

The first proviso to Article 1 of the Plenary Powers Resolution required that not less than one year's notice should be given in a specified number of journals that the question of the possible suspension of the *Règles* was under consideration in any given case. Dr. Lemche and the Scandinavian zoologists associated with him recommended that this period should be reduced to six months. Much criticism had been directed against the Commission in regard especially to the dilatory nature of its procedure in dealing with applications for the suspension of the *Règles*. It was important that adequate notice should be given of such applications, but it was equally important that there should be no unnecessary delay in dealing with this type of case. Experience showed that, where zoologists saw objection to the use of the plenary powers in any case of which they had expert knowledge, they normally communicated their objection to the

Secretary within a short space of time after the publication of the notice that the Commission were considering the possibility of using their plenary powers. There was a presumption, therefore, that a delay of one year was unnecessarily long. It must be remembered also that the period of one year's delay had been imposed in 1913 when regular air-mail services had not been introduced and in consequence a much longer period was required than at present to enable zoologists living at the other end of the world first to become aware of the publication of the notice of possible suspension of the *Règles* and second to communicate their views thereon to the Secretariat of the Commission. In the circumstances, therefore, it was felt that the proposal submitted by Dr. Lemche and his colleagues that the period of delay should be reduced from twelve months to six months was reasonable and should be accepted.

(c) *The serials in which the required notice should be given:*

In the Plenary Powers Resolution of 1913 it was laid down that notice of the possible suspension of the *Règles* in any given case should be given in not less than two of five specified serials. That Resolution was adopted 30 years before the establishment of the Commission's *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature.* If that journal had been in existence at that time, it could not be doubted that it would have been specified as one of the places in which notices of the possible suspension of the *Règles* should be published. Dr. Lemche and his colleagues proposed that the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* should now be made the principal serial in which all notices of possible suspensions of the *Règles* should in future be published. This proposal, it was generally agreed, was eminently reasonable and should be adopted.

Experience had shown that in existing conditions it was often difficult to secure space for notices of possible suspensions of the *Règles* and in several cases space had only been secured through the insertion of these notices as paid advertisements at a considerable outlay. The serials specified in the Resolution of 1913 were appropriate for the issue of notices affecting a wide range of workers, especially workers in the applied biological sciences; they were not necessarily the most appropriate medium for the publication of notices relating to names of interest only, or primarily, to specialists in a particular group, for whom the publication of these notices in some specialist serial would be much more convenient. Publication in such serials would, moreover, bring these cases before a much wider circle of interested specialists. It was generally agreed that what was required was a system under which, in addition to being published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, notices of possible suspensions of the *Règles* should be published in at least one scientific serial in Europe and at least one such serial in America, and that, so far as might be practicable, the Secretary to the Commission should in addition send copies of such notices to specialist serials concerned with groups comprising generic or specific names proposed to be dealt with under the plenary powers. The serials in question would vary from one case to another and it would therefore not be possible to include a reference to such serials in the amended wording now to be adopted. The introduction of these changes would, it was felt, serve the further important advantage that it would eliminate the risk which existed at present that the whole machinery for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers might be rendered unworkable either through its becoming impossible to secure the publication of the prescribed notices in the specified serials or through those serials themselves ceasing publication.

(d) *The date as from which the prescribed period of notice is to run:*

Attention was drawn to the fact that it was necessary clearly to prescribe the date as from which the prescribed period of notice was to run. In view of the difficulty in obtaining space in general science serials in existing conditions, a considerable delay might be involved if it were to be decided that the period should run from the date on which the notice was published in the last of the serials to which it was sent for publication. Moreover, there was always the risk that for one reason or another it would prove impossible to secure publication in one of the selected serials. These difficulties did not arise in the case of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, which was directly under the control of the Commission. For this reason and because the *Bulletin* was the Official Organ of the Commission and thus the serial to which zoologists would naturally refer for information on all matters relating to the work of the Commission, it was generally agreed that the prescribed period in which zoologists would be free to comment upon proposals for the suspension of the *Règles* should run from the date of publication of the part of the *Bulletin* containing the prescribed notice.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to recommend that the following amendments be made in the Resolution adopted by the International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Monaco in 1913, under which the Congress conferred plenary powers upon the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to suspend the *Règles*, as applied to any given case, where, in the opinion of the Commission, the strict application of the *Règles* would clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity :—

(a) *Article* 1, *First Proviso:* (i) the period of notice to be reduced from twelve months to six months ; (ii) the words " in any two or more . . . and the *Zoologischer Anzeiger* " to be deleted and the following words inserted in their place : " in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and in two other serials, of which one is to be a serial published in Europe and the other a serial published in America, the serials in question to be selected on each occasion by the Secretary to the Commission as being, in his opinion, the serials, in which publication of the notice is best calculated to bring the subject matter of the notice to the attention of interested specialists " ; (iii) words to be inserted to make it clear that the period of six months referred to in (i) above runs from the date on which the notice relating to any given case is published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature;*

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion* 6(*b*))

(b) *Article* 1, *Second Proviso:* the words " provided also that the vote in the Commission is unanimously in favour of suspension " to be deleted and words to be inserted in their place specifying that the vote in the Commission is to be either unanimous or, if by a majority, by a majority calculated in the manner agreed upon by the Commission in their revised voting procedure ;

(c) *Article* 1, *Third Proviso:* to be deleted ;

(d) *Article* 2 (" *That in the event that a case . . . is concerned* ") : (i) this Article to be deleted ; but (ii) words to be inserted at some appropriate point in the revised text embodying the proposition laid down in the last sentence of this Article, namely that a decision taken by the Commission under their plenary powers is final and not subject to appeal ;

(For a later decision on Article 4, See Paris Session. 11th Meeting, Conclusion 18)

(e) *Articles* 3 *and* 4 : to be renumbered 2 and 3 respectively ;

(2) to recommend that the provisions contained in the Plenary Powers Resolution of 1913, amended as shown in (1) above, be incorporated in an Article in the *Règles;*

(3) to take note of, and approve, a statement by the Secretary to the Commission that, in exercising the discretion conferred upon him by conclusion (1) (a) above regarding the choice of serials to which notices of possible suspensions of the *Règles* should be sent, it was his present intention :—

(a) to select the serials *Nature* and *Science* as the serials published in Europe and America respectively, for so long as those serials were prepared to insert the prescribed notices in question either free of charge or in return for the payment of a reasonable fee and publish the notices in question with reasonable promptness ;

(b) to send copies of the prescribed notices or, where those notices relate to names in widely separated groups, extracts from those notices to one or more selected serials specially concerned with the groups in question ;

(c) to endeavour, in addition, to secure that the prescribed notices or references thereto were published also in leading serials published in the French, German, Italian and Spanish languages.

Date of entry into force of the reforms agreed upon in regard to the procedure of the Commission

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusions 6 *and* 7)

8. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the question of the date as from which the reforms in their procedure agreed upon during the present meeting should come into operation.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reminded the Commission that, although some of the reforms which had just been approved could be brought into operation by the Commission without reference to the Congress, others required the approval of the Congress before they could be made operative. Unless, therefore, special steps were taken, the reforms belonging to this second class would not come into operation until they were approved at the *Concilium Plenum* to be held on the last day of the present Congress. This would be most unfortunate, for it was the wish of all zoologists that the Commission should take the fullest possible advantage of the opportunity presented by the meeting of the present Congress to reduce to the greatest possible extent the arrears of work which had accumulated during the war years. This would not be possible if for the remainder of the present meeting the Commission were hampered by obsolete procedural rules. It would therefore, he believed, be in accordance with the general will that the reformed procedure now agreed upon should be brought into operation forthwith. He accordingly proposed that the Commission should submit to the Section on Nomenclature a recommendation to this effect.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that the reformed rules of procedure agreed upon during the present meeting and recorded in Conclusions 6 and 7 above should enter into force forthwith.

Changes in procedure designed to accelerate the work of the Commission

9. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the recommendation submitted by the Executive Committee in Commission Paper I.C.(48)4, as summarised in paragraph 6 (3) of that paper, for the adoption of certain changes in procedure for the purpose of shortening the period between the date of receipt of applications by the Commission and the date on which decisions thereon are taken and announced.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

> that, having regard to the importance of taking every practicable step to secure that in future decisions on applications submitted to the Commission should be taken as rapidly as was consistent with due consideration of the issues involved, the procedure to be

adopted in dealing with such applications should be as follows :—

(a) Subject to the necessary funds being available, every application submitted to the Commission or, in the case of a long paper, an agreed summary thereof, shall be published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* as soon as possible after its receipt by the Secretary, subject to the Secretary first satisfying himself (i) that the application is in appropriate form with all the bibliographical and other data necessary to enable the Commission to reach a decision thereon and (ii) that it is drafted in accordance with the requirements of *Declaration* 4.

(For a decision to incorporate Declaration 4 *in the "Règles," see Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 52)

(b) Each issue of the *Bulletin* containing the texts of applications submitted to the Commission shall contain a notice displayed in a prominent position drawing attention to the fact that voting on the said applications will normally be started at the end of six calendar months calculated from the date of the publication of the said issue of the *Bulletin* and inviting any reader who wishes to submit comments on the proposals in question to do so in writing to the Secretary to the Commission as quickly as possible and in any case in sufficient time to enable the communication in question to reach that officer before the expiry of the six-month period referred to above.

(c) As soon as possible after the expiry of the period referred to in (b) above, the Secretary shall report to the members of the Commission any comments which he may have received in regard to any such application and shall at the same time submit recommendations as to the terms of the *Opinion* or *Declaration* proposed to be rendered by the Commission in regard to the said application, together with voting papers to be used in connection therewith.

(d) In order to eliminate the delay in the promulgation of decisions which has occurred in the past owing to the inevitable interval between the taking of a decision and its embodiment in an *Opinion* or *Declaration* and the printing and publication of that *Opinion* or *Declaration*, the "summary" of the *Opinion* or *Declaration* agreed upon by the Commission shall be published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* as soon as possible after the conclusion of the voting thereon.

Announcement to be made to the zoological public regarding the arrangements made by the Commission for speeding up its work

10. THE COMMISSION had before them proposals submitted by the Executive Committee in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)4,** as summarised in paragraph 6 (4) of that paper, for the issue of an announcement to the zoological public regarding the arrangements now agreed upon for speeding up the work of the Commission.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to request the Secretary to take all practicable steps, by the issue of notices to the scientific press or otherwise, to bring to the attention of zoologists and palaeozoologists the revised procedure specified in Conclusion 8 above, agreed upon by the Commission for the purpose of speeding up its work, and at the same time :—

(a) to explain that the Commission hope that, when the existing backlog of applications has been worked off, they will normally be able to announce their decision on any given application within a period of about 15 months from the date of its receipt ;

(b) to express the hope of the Commission that, where an application published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* is concerned with the proposed use by the Commission of their plenary powers to suspend the *Règles* for the purpose of validating a name or a nomenclatorial usage, which, under a strict application of the *Règles*, would need to be sunk in synonymy or changed, as the case may be, specialists in the group concerned will recognise that, as the case is *sub judice*, no action should be taken which might prejudice the decision to be reached by the Commission and that they will therefore refrain from aggravating the position by changing the name or the usage concerned until such time as a decision is given by the Commission.

Revision of the By-Laws of the Commission

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 16)

11. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the By-Laws of the Commission should be thoroughly revised so as to set out clearly the decisions taken by the Congress, as regards matters requiring the approval of that body, and

by the Commission, as regards matters with which it was competent for the Commission to deal, in regard to such subjects as :—

(a) the functions, powers and duties of the Commission ;

(b) the composition of the Commission ;

(c) the procedure to be followed in the election of members of the Commission ;

(d) the election of Alternate Members in certain cases ;

(e) the grant of leave of absence to members of the Commission in certain cases ;

(f) the removal of members of the Commission in certain circumstances ;

(g) the duties of members of the Commission ;

(h) the officers of the Commission and their duties ;

(i) the composition and duties of the Executive Committee of the Commission ;

(j) the procedure to be followed, whether at meetings of the Commission or, by correspondence, during inter-Congress periods, in voting on proposed *Declarations* and proposed *Opinions*, either involving or not involving, in the last-named case, the use of the plenary powers of the Commission ;

(k) the publication of *Declarations* and *Opinions* and of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature;*

(l) the procedure to be followed at meetings of the Commission ;

(m) the publication of minutes of meetings and Reports ;

(n) the regulation of the financial affairs of the Commission in co-operation with the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature ;

(o) the amendment of the By-Laws ;

(p) the publication of the By-Laws ;

(2) to invite the Secretary to the Commission to prepare, as soon as might be found conveniently practicable after the close of the Congress, the draft of a revised text of the By-Laws on the lines indicated in (l) above and to circulate that draft to the members of the Commission for approval ;

(3) that, as soon as the Commission had reached agreement on the draft text referred to in (2) above, the revised By-Laws should be printed and copies placed on sale by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature.

Fourth meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session : date and time noted

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion* 36)

12. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) suggested that now that the Commission had completed their examination of the proposals relating to the procedure of the Commission submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)4, a convenient point had been reached at which to terminate the work of the Commission for the day. As already arranged, their next meeting, the fourth of their Paris Session, would be held at the same place at 0900 hours on the morning of the following day.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to adjourn until 0900 hours on the morning of the following day, Thursday, 22nd July, 1948.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned at* 2315 *hours.*)

PURCHASED
19 APR 1950

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 21st–27th July, 1948

CONCLUSIONS of the Fourth Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Thursday, 22nd July, 1948, at 0900 hours

PRESENT:

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
Professor E. Beltrán (Mexico)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Professor Z. P. Metcalf (U.S.A.)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present:

Professor Pierre Bonnet (France)
M. André Chavan (France)
Mr. Jean Delacour (U.S.A.)
Mr. C. F. dos Passos (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (U.S.A.)
Dr. H. A. F. Gohar (Egypt)
Professor E. Raymond Hall (U.S.A.)
Professor W. P. Hayes (U.S.A.)
M. Denis Jacques (France)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Dr. S. di Toledo Piza (Brazil)
Mr. R. Winckworth (United Kingdom)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*
Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer*

Election of Prof. E. Beltrán (Mexico) to be an Alternate Member of the Commission for the duration of the Paris Session
(Previous reference: Paris Session, 1st Meeting, Conclusion 6(2))

1. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reported that, in accordance with the arrangement made at the first meeting of the Commission during its present Session, Professor Enrique Beltrán (Mexico) had been invited to serve as an Alternate Member of the Commission during the present Session of meetings *vice* Commissioner Angel Cabrera (Argentina), who was unable to be present. This invitation had been accepted by Professor Beltrán.

THE COMMISSION:—

took note of the above statement and welcomed Professor Beltrán to their table.

THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, have great pleasure in expressing their grateful thanks to the UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION (U.N.E.S.C.O.) for the financial assistance afforded towards the cost of producing the present volume.

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Notice to subscribers regarding the arrangements made for the completion of volume 1 and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5

The following arrangements have been made for completing volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5 :—

Volume 1 : A concluding Part (Part 12), containing, *inter alia*, the Title Page, Table of Contents, and alphabetical subject index, will be published shortly.

Volume 2 : This volume, like Volume 1, will be devoted to the publication of applications in regard to nomenclatorial problems submitted by specialists to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. Publication will commence at an early date.

Volume 3 : This volume will be devoted to the publication of the memoranda, reports and other documents considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at their meetings held in Paris in July 1948. Parts 1-6 have already been published and it is expected that this volume will be completed shortly on the issue of Parts 7-9.

Volume 4 : This volume will be devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July* 1948.

Volume 5 : At the request of the Bureau of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, this volume will be devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July* 1948, together with the Reports submitted to the Congress by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature.

INQUIRIES

All inquiries regarding publications should be addressed to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, and all inquiries regarding the scientific work of the Commission to the Secretary to the Commission at the following addresses :—

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7, England.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : Secretariat of the Commission, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.

VOLUME 4. Parts 4/6
pp. 63—158.

25th May, 1950

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

PURCHASED
2 MAY 1950

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

CONTENTS:

The Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July 1948: Page

Conclusions of Fourth Meeting (*concluding portion*) - - - - - 63-82
Conclusions of Fifth Meeting - - - 83-106
Conclusions of Sixth Meeting (*first instalment*) - - - - - 107-158

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948,
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature at the Publications Office of the Trust 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1950

Price One pound, eight shillings.

(*All rights reserved*)

Telegrams despatched by the Acting President on behalf of the Commission

2. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that at their first meeting during their present Session the Commission had invited him to address a telegram to Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark) expressing their regret that ill-health prevented him from being present at the Session now in progress, and that at their second meeting the Commission had invited him to address telegrams to President Karl Jordan expressing their regret at his decision to relinquish the Office of President and to the Right Honourable Walter Elliot expressing their thanks for his having accepted the Presidency of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature. In the discharge of these requests, he had now despatched the following telegrams :—

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 1st Meeting, Conclusion* 4)

(a) *Telegram to Commissioner Th. Mortensen*

" The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature sincerely regret that your health makes it impossible for you to be present with them in Paris and send you their best wishes for speedy recovery."

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion* 18(6))

(b) *Telegram to President Karl Jordan*

" The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature assembled in Paris have received your resignation of the Presidency with deep regret but feel bound to respect your wishes and to relieve you of the burden of office. They propose, however, to renominate you as a member of the Commission and intend to invite the Congress to appoint you also as Honorary Life-President."

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion* 27)

(c) *Telegram to the Right Honourable Walter Elliot*

" At this their first meeting since the formation of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature now assembled in Paris desire to express their grateful thanks to you for accepting the Presidency of the Trust."

THE COMMISSION :—

took note of, and thanked the Acting President for taking, the action on their behalf reported above.

Meaning of the expression " nomenclature binaire " as used in the " Règles "

3. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a note by the Secretary to the Commission covering the draft of a Report to be submitted by the Commission to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology on the meaning of the expression " nomenclature binaire " as used in the *Règles* (Commission Paper I.C.(48)5).

In introducing this paper, THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that for many years there had been controversy regarding the meaning to be attached to the expression "nomenclature binaire" as used in Proviso (b) to Article 25 of the *Règles*. There had been violent dissension on this subject at the meeting of the Congress held at Padua in 1930, when the Section on Nomenclature had (by a majority) adopted a resolution on the interpretation to be given to this expression. That resolution had been invalid because it had been put to the vote, notwithstanding the fact that prior notice of the intention to move this resolution had not been given by its proposer to the Commission. That action was in contravention of a decision taken by the Congress of Cambridge (1898) and confirmed by the Congress of Berlin (1901) that, except with the concurrence of the Commission, no resolution relating to the *Règles* was to be put to the vote in the Section on Nomenclature, unless at least one year's notice had been given to the Commission. The situation created by the Padua incident had been considered at Lisbon in 1935 by the *Comité Permanent des Congrès Internationaux de Zoologie* who had referred the whole matter back to the President of the Section on Nomenclature who in turn had invited the Commission to submit a Report thereon at the next meeting of the Congress. That invitation had been accepted by the Commission and this method of making a fresh approach to the subject had been approved by the Congress of Lisbon at its final plenary Session.

(*Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 5th Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

The draft Report now submitted to the Commission for their consideration was the fruit of much discussion between himself, as Secretary to the Commission, and leading specialists in Europe and America. Those discussions led him to believe both that this question was no longer controversial and that the settlement suggested in the draft Report would be generally acceptable.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to approve the text of the draft Report on the meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire" as used in the *Règles* submitted by the Secretary to the Commission under cover of the memorandum circulated as Commission Paper I.C.(48)5 and to adopt that text as the text of the Report to be submitted by the Commission to the President of the Section on Nomenclature of the present Congress;

(2) to authorise and request the Secretary to the Commission to sign the Report adopted in (1) above and to submit it forthwith on behalf of

the Commission to the President of the Section on Nomenclature ;

(3) in pursuance of the terms of the Report referred to above :—

(a) to recommend the Congress :—

(i) to substitute the expression " nomenclature binominale " for the expression " nomenclature binaire " in Article 25 and Article 26 of the *Règles;*

(*For a later decision regarding the numbering of the Schedules to the " Règles ", see Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 31)

(ii) to attach to the *Règles* a Schedule, to be known as the " First Schedule," in contrast to the present *Appendice*, here recommended in future to be known as the " Second Schedule," and to direct that every decision, whether to validate or to suppress a given book or name or to alter the usage of a name, taken, or hereafter to be taken, by the Commission under their plenary powers be recorded in the said First Schedule ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion* 7(2))

(iii) to insert in the Article recommended to be inserted in the *Règles* embodying, subject to certain agreed amendments, the provisions of the Plenary Powers Resolution of 1913 (*Declaration* 5) a provision exempting applications relating to the status of generic names published after 1757 by authors who in the book or paper concerned did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature from the requirement that a specified period shall elapse between the date on which the application in question is published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and the date on which the Commission may take a final decision thereon ;

(iv) to insert in the First Schedule to the *Règles* the entry " Brisson (M.J.), 1760, *Ornithologia sive Synopsis methodica sistens Avium Divisionem in Ordines* " as the title of a book, generic names in which are to be accepted as having availability under

Article 25, notwithstanding the fact that they were published by an author who in the work concerned did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature;

(b) to cancel *Opinions* 20 and 37, the interpretations of the *Règles* contained in which had now been ruled by the Commission as incorrect;

(c) to substitute the words " who used a non-binominal nomenclature " for the words " who used a binary (Art. 25) (though not binominal) nomenclature " in the first sentence of the " summary " to *Opinion* 24;

(d) to substitute the words " On the species eligible for selection as the type species of a genus established by a binominal author, where some or all of the originally included species were not cited by binominal names " for the words " Types of genera of binary but not binominal authors " as the title of *Opinion* 35;

(4) to congratulate the Secretary to the Commission on the masterly fashion in which he had marshalled the data relating to the meaning of the expression " nomenclature binaire " for the consideration of the Commission.

Consolidation and amendment of the " Règles " : preliminary consideration

4. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission outlining proposals for the consolidation and amendment of the *Règles* (Commission Paper I.C.(48)6, Part 1).

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) approved generally the proposals for the consolidation and amendment of the *Règles* submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in Commission Paper I.C.(48)6;

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 10)

(2) agreed to direct their energies towards securing :—

(a) the incorporation in the *Règles* of provisions embodying the interpretations of existing Articles given by the Commission in interpretative *Opinions* already rendered, subject to such modifications or exceptions as they might consider proper;

(b) the clarification of certain provisions in the *Règles* relating to important questions on nomenclature, where the meaning of those

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 13)

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 1)

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 5th Meeting, Conclusion* 1)

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 50)

provisions was in dispute, e.g. :—

- (i) the meaning of the expression " indication " as used in relation to generic names in Proviso (a) to Article 25 ;
- (ii) the meaning of the provisions in Articles 35 and 36 relating to specific homonyms ;
- (iii) the status, if any, of names proposed for forms of less than subspecific rank ;

(c) the clarification of certain provisions in the *Règles*, where the implication of those provisions was in doubt ;

(d) the insertion in the *Règles* of provisions on various matters not dealt with in any of the existing Articles ;

(e) the substitution of " *Recommandations* " for mandatory provisions in certain cases ;

(f) the incorporation in the *Règles* of provisions embodying resolutions on nomenclature and nomenclatorial practice adopted at various times by the Commission or by the Commission and the Congress and subsequently recorded in *Declarations* rendered by the Commission ;

(g) the remedying of grammatical and other defects in the *Règles* due to careless or inexpert drafting ;

(h) the completion of the substantive French text of the *Règles;*

(i) the securing of accurate translations in English and other languages of the substantive French text of the *Règles.*

Status of new names published in a form or in a manner contravening Articles 14-16, 18 and 20

5. In the course of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 4(2)(c) above, THE COMMISSION had under consideration the position arising when a new name was published in a form or in a manner which contravened one or other of Articles 14–16, 18 and 20 (Commission Paper I.C.(48)6, paragraph 11). The *Règles* did not make it clear whether a name so published was to be corrected automatically by later authors to make it conform with the requirements of the *Règles* or whether (as appeared to be implied by *Opinion* 8) a name published in contravention of any of the foregoing provisions was to be preserved for all time in the incorrect form in which it was originally published. An allied question on which a clarification of the *Règles* was required was whether, when a name was emended under Article 19, that name in its emended form ranked for purposes of priority (1) from the date on which the name of which it was an emendation was published, or (2) only from the date on which the emendation was published. Arising out of this last point, there was also the question of the author to whom an emended name should be credited. Should it be the original author of the incorrectly formed name or the author by whom the emendation was published ?

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to recommend that provisions should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear :—

(a) that, where a name is published in a form or in a manner which contravenes any of the provisions contained in Articles 14–16, 18 or Article 20, the error so committed is automatically to be corrected by subsequent authors ;

(b) that, where a name is originally published in a form or in a manner which contravenes any of the Articles specified in (a) above but later that error is removed by the name being corrected or by the form of its citation being altered, as the case may be, the name in its corrected form or with its corrected mode of citation ranks for purposes of priority from the date on which it was originally published in an incorrect form or in an incorrect manner and is to be attributed to the author by whom it was so published and not to the author by whom it was corrected or by whom it was first cited in a correct manner ;

(c) that, where a name is validly emended in accordance with the provisions of Article 19, that name ranks for purposes of priority from the date on which it was originally published in an incorrect form and is to be attributed to the author by whom it was so published ;

(2) to cancel *Opinion* 8, the interpretation of the *Règles* contained in which was incorrect.

Article 25, Proviso (c)(2) : the expression "definite bibliographic reference"

6. In the course of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 4(2)(e) above, the ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the general policy recommended to the Commission was that ritualistic provisions, which had been included at different times in Article 25

(Law of Priority) and which had the unintended but unfortunate effect of invalidating names which, though otherwise properly published, were defective on some highly technical ground, should be replaced by others of a more liberal, i.e. less rigorous, character but that *Recommandations* should be added at appropriate points in Article 25 indicating the ideal procedure to be aimed at. The problem now to be considered was the position created by the insertion in Article 25 (by the Budapest Congress of 1927) of the provision that, in order to satisfy the requirements of that Article, a name published after 31st December, 1930, as a substitute for a previously published name must be accompanied by a " definite bibliographic reference " to the name to be replaced. At their meeting held at Lisbon in 1935 the Commission had considered a request for an elucidation of the meaning of this expression, and in answer to that question had ruled (*Opinion* 138) that this expression required that a new name published as a substitute name should be accompanied by a bibliographical reference consisting of the name to be replaced, its author, the date of its publication, the work or serial in which it was published, the number of the volume, if the work was published in more than one volume, and the number of the page on which the name appeared. In view of the use of the expression " definite bibliographic reference " in Article 25, no other interpretation could logically have been given by the Commission. This decision had had, however, an unfortunate effect, for it had invalidated names which were otherwise perfectly satisfactory, as had been pointed out in a communication submitted to the Commission by Dr. J. Brookes Knight (Washington) acting on behalf of the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America (Commission File Z.N.(S)352).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to recommend :—

(a) the deletion of Section (2) of Proviso (c) to Article 25 and the insertion in its place of a new Section (2) as follows :—

" in the case of a name proposed as a substitute for a name which is invalid by reason of being a homonym, with a reference to the name which is thereby replaced "

insertion of a *Recommandation* to Proviso (c)(2), urging authors, when publishing substitute names, to give a full bibliographical reference to the name so replaced, that is, to cite the name itself, its author, the date on which it was published, the title of the book or serial in which it was published, the volume number where the book or serial consists of more than one volume, and the page number or, where the pages are not numbered, the number or letter or other mark distinguishing the portion of the text in which the name concerned was published ;

(2) to cancel *Opinion* 138, as from the date on which Article 25 is amended in the sense recommended in (1) above, when that *Opinion*, by reason of referring to the existing text of Article 25, will have ceased to be applicable.

Article 25, Proviso (c)(1) : the expression " which differentiate . . . "

7. THE COMMISSION considered next the expression " with a summary of characters which differentiate or distinguish the genus or species from other genera or species," as used in Section (1) to Proviso (c) to Article 25. Professor H. B. Hungerford (U.S.A.) (Commission File Z.N.(S)61) had asked whether, under these words, it was necessary that a description of a new species, in order to make the new name available, must contain an express reference to, and a comparison with, some previously published species (see Hungerford, 1945, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 102–103).

In the discussion which ensued, it was generally agreed that, though well-intentioned, this provision in Article 25 was open to the objection that it invalidated otherwise properly published names on a purely technical nomenclatorial ground. It was a ritualistic provision which should be modified in conformity with the principle adopted in dealing with the expression " definite bibliographic reference." What was needed was that this provision should require a higher standard for names published after 31st December, 1930, than for names published before that date (when all that was required was that the new name should be published with an " indication, definition or description "). The provision in question should, however, be less rigorous than that contained in the existing Section (1) to Proviso (c). It was pointed out that, if the requirement that the description should be comparative were to be deleted, the only distinction which could be drawn in this matter between names published on or after 1st January, 1931, and names published before 1st January, 1931, was between names which, when first published, had been accompanied by words giving particulars of characters and those which depended for their availability, in the case of

(For a later decision on the status of generic names published before 1st *January* 1931 *without a type species, see Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 13)

generic names, solely upon the designation or citation of a type species, and, in the case of the trivial names of species or subspecies, solely upon an accompanying figure or illustration.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

(1) the deletion of Section (1) of Proviso (c) to Article 25 and the insertion in its place of a new Section (1) as follows:—

> "with a statement in words indicating the characters of the genus, species or subspecies concerned."

(For a decision to extend this provision consequent upon the admission of the names of forms of less than subspecific rank to rights under the Law of Priority, see Paris Session, 5th Meeting, Conclusion 1)

(2) to insert a *Recommandation* to Proviso (c)(1), urging authors, when drawing up descriptions of new genera, subgenera, species or subspecies to give not only an absolute, but also a comparative, description thereof, by indicating:—

- (a) *in the case of a generic or subgeneric name*, the characters which separate the genus or subgenus concerned from the previously described genus or subgenus to which it is considered that the new genus or subgenus is most closely allied;
- (b) *in the case of a specific name*, the characters which separate the new species from the previously described species to which it is considered to be most closely allied, and, if that is a little-known species, the characters which separate the new species from a well-known or common species included in the genus;
- (c) *in the case of a subspecific name*, the characters which distinguish the new subspecies from the subspecies to which it is considered to be most closely allied, and, if that is a little-known subspecies, the characters which distinguish the new subspecies from a well-known or common subspecies of the species concerned.

Article 25, Proviso (c)(3): the expression "definite unambiguous designation of the type species"; Article 29 and 30 consequential amendments

8. THE COMMISSION turned to the consideration of of the expression "definite unambiguous designation of the type species" as used in Section (3) to Proviso (c) to Article 25. This question, which was referred to in paragraphs 13 and 15 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)6, had been brought to the attention of the Commission by Professor E. Gorton Linsley, on behalf of the American Committee on Entomological Nomenclature (Commission File Z.N.(S)342).

In the discussion of this problem, it was noted that this was another example of a well-intentioned provision which had the unintended effect of invalidating names on highly technical nomenclatorial grounds. For example, under this provision, a name published after 31st December, 1930 for a new monobasic genus was invalid, if the author of that genus failed to give a " definite unambiguous citation " of the type species. It was a ritualistic provision which should be modified in accordance with the principle adopted in the similar cases in Sections (1) and (2) of the same Proviso (Proviso (c)) to Article 25. There was general agreement that the reasonable course to adopt would be to provide that for the purposes of Section (3) of Proviso (c) a generic name published after 31st December, 1930, must have its type species clearly designated or, as the case may be, indicated in accordance with one or other of the Rules laid down in the first group of Rules (i.e. the group headed " Cases in which the generic type is accepted solely upon the basis of the original publication ") given in the Article (Article 30) which lays down the way in which the type species of genera are to be determined.

(*For a decision to amend the phraseology used in this part of Article* 30, *see Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 5)

(*For a decision amplifying this decision, see Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 68)

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) to delete Section (3) to Proviso (c) to Article 25 and insert in its place a new Section (3) in the following sense :—

> " in the case of a generic or subgeneric name, with a type species designated or, as the case may be, indicated in accordance with one or other of the rules prescribed for determining the type species of a genus or subgenus solely upon the basis of the original publication (i.e. Rules (a) to (d) in Article 30) "

(2) to add to Article 25 a *Recommandation* strongly urging every author, when publishing a name for a new genus or subgenus :—

- (a) expressly to designate by name the type species of the genus or subgenus as the case may be ;
- (b) when designating as the type species a species the name of which has already been published, to cite that species, first under the binominal combination under which the species was originally published, giving at the same time a bibliographical reference to the place where that name was published, and second under its new binominal combination consisting of the new generic name and the trivial name of the species or, in the case of a new subgeneric name, of the generic

name of the species, the new subgeneric name and the trivial name of the species (an example of each type of case being added);

(3) that a similar *Recommandation* in relation to the selection of the type species of a genus by an author under Rule (g) in Article 30 be added to that Article and that the existing *Recommandation* to Article 29 be deleted.

Status of the provisions in the former "Appendice" now a Schedule to the " Règles " (*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 3(3)(a)(ii))

(*For a later decision regarding the numbering of the Schedules to the " Règles " see Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 31)

9. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the proposals in regard to the status of the provisions in what was at present called the *Appendice* to the *Règles* but which it had been agreed to recommend should in future be styled the Second Schedule, submitted in paragraph 18(1) of Commission Paper I.C.(48)6.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that an Article should be inserted in the *Règles* referring to the Second Schedule (i.e. the present *Appendice*) and making it clear that the provisions included therein were not mandatory but were in the nature of recommendations as to good nomenclatorial practice.

Grammatical inconsistencies in the " Règles "

10. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the recommendations submitted in paragraph 18(2) of Commission Paper I.C.(48)6, for the removal of grammatical inconsistencies from the *Règles*, particularly the random and haphazard use of the tenses of the verb " être " (to be).

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that, in the forthcoming revision of the *Règles*, care should be taken to remove the grammatical inconsistencies which mar the existing text and in particular to ensure the use of the correct tenses of the verb " être " (to be) to indicate the mandatory character of the Articles included in the *Règles* and the non-mandatory character of the provisions of the Second Schedule.

Article 31 : need for the removal of confusion between taxonomy and nomenclature and for the substitution of direct provisions for the existing provisions by reference

11. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the difficulties arising from the confusion in the *Règles* between taxonomy and nomenclature referred to in paragraph 18(3) of Commission Paper I.C.(48)6, with special reference to Article 31, which, as at present drafted, appeared to prescribe a procedure for the " subdivision d'une espèce " and the " subdivision d'un genre," both of which were taxonomic matters, with which a code of nomenclature was not directly concerned. What this Article was intended to provide for were the nomenclatorial implications of the taxonomic operations in question and not the operations themselves. It was important that this defect should be eliminated from this Article. It was important also that specific instructions should be included in the *Règles* regarding the method to be followed in determining to which of two or more species originally included in a composite nominal species, the name given to that species should adhere. The aim should be to secure that Article 31 should apply as closely as possible to the type specimen of a nominal species the rules laid down in Article 30 for determining the type species of a genus, the name of which had been published prior to 1st January, 1931. Naturally, there should be included in Article 31 also provisions parallel to any provisions supplementing or clarifying the corresponding Rules in Article 30 which might be agreed upon during the present Congress.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that in its present form Article 31 was defective, both because the phraseology involved implied a confusion between taxonomy and nomenclature, and because in so important a matter as that dealt with in this Article it was essential that the required provisions should be expressly stated and not left to be inferred by reference to another Article (Article 30) dealing with an only partially comparable question ;

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 26)

(2) in view of (1) above, to recommend that Article 31 in its present form should be deleted from the *Règles* and that in place of the present text of that Article there should be inserted provisions laying down for the determination of the identity of a nominal species rules parallel to those prescribed for determining the identity (i.e. the type species) of a genus in Article 29 and in Rules (a), (b), (c) and (g) in Article 30, that is to say provisions prescribing :—

(a) that, where a nominal species is found to be a composite species, the name given to that nominal species is to be applied to one or other of the component species, and that where the original author of a nominal species designated a given specimen to be the type specimen of that nominal species or an illustration, figure, or previously published description exclusively to represent the type specimen, the name in question shall in all circumstances adhere to the taxonomic species represented by that specimen or, as the case may be, by the illustration, figure or previously published description so designated to represent that specimen (provision parallel to Article 29) ;

(For a later decision prescribing the terminology to be applied to type specimens, see Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 75)

(b) that, where an author publishes the name of a nominal species, based either (i) upon two or more specimens or (ii) partly upon one or more specimens and partly upon one or more illustrations or figures (whether then published for the first time or previously published) or upon one or more previously published descriptions or upon any combination of the above, the type specimen of the nominal species or, as the case may be, the illustration, figure or previously published description which shall thereafter exclusively represent the type specimen shall be determined in accordance with the following Rules applied successively (provision parallel to introductory portion of Article 30) :—

(i) where at the time of the publication of the name of a nominal species the original author thereof designátes either (1) one specimen to be the type specimen or (2) one illustration or one figure or one previously published description exclusively to represent the type specimen, the specimen, illustration, figure or previously published description so designated shall be the type specimen of the nominal species or, as the case may be, shall thereafter exclusively represent the type specimen (Rule parallel to Rule (a) in Article 30) ;

(ii) where, in default of a type designation under (i) above, the original author of the name of a nominal species indicates that one but not more than one specimen is the type specimen by affixing thereto a label bearing the legend " type " or its equivalent, the specimen so labelled shall be the type specimen of that nominal species (Rule parallel to Rule (b) in Article 30) ;

(iii) where neither Rule (i) nor Rule (ii) above is applicable (1) any one specimen included in the original author's type material, not being a specimen excluded from consideration under (d) below, or (2) any one of the illustrations, figures or published descriptions cited in the original description of the nominal species which is the first subsequently to be selected by the same or another author to be the type specimen or, as the case may be, exclusively to represent the type specimen, shall be the type specimen of that nominal species or shall exclusively represent that specimen, the expressions " select the type specimen " and " select to represent the type specimen " to be rigidly construed and to exclude the application of the trivial name of the nominal species concerned to a single originally included specimen, illustration, figure or previously published description, unaccompanied by a clear indication that a selection is being made (Rule parallel to Rule (g) in Article 30) ;

(c) that, where an author publishes the name of a nominal species based exclusively (i) upon a single specimen, or (ii) upon a single illustration or figure (whether then published for the first time or previously published) or (iii) upon a single previously published description, the single specimen or the single illustration or figure or the single previously published description in question shall be, or, as the case may be, shall exclusively represent, the type specimen of that nominal species (Rule parallel to Rule (c) in Article 30) ;

(d) that no specimen, illustration, figure or previously published description is eligible to be selected to be the type specimen, or, as the case may be, to represent the type specimen, of a nominal species, if that specimen, illustration, figure or description was only doubtfully referred to the nominal species by the original author in his description of that species or was, or represented, a *specimen inquirendum* from the standpoint of that author (provision parallel to Rule (e) in Article 30);

(e) that the interpretation of Rule (g) in Article 30 in relation to the type species of genera given in the Commission's *Opinion* 6, shall apply to the type specimen of a nominal species, only where the name of such a species was published prior to 1st January, 1931 and where that species was based upon two, but not more than two, specimens and one of those specimens was later designated as the type specimen of another nominal species by the same or another author;

(f) that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, two or more nominal species were founded, in whole or in part, upon the same type material, any one specimen which formed part of the type material of both nominal species may be selected as the type specimen of either or both of the nominal species concerned (provision parallel to that applied to Article 30 by *Opinion* 62);

(g) that, where an author, when publishing the name of a nominal species, either (i) omits to specify the material on which that nominal species is based and it is later found impossible to trace that material, or (ii) specifies his type material, but that material either (a) is so imperfect or in such bad condition as to render it impossible to recognise the taxonomic species of which it consists, or (b) was lost or destroyed before the identity of the taxonomic species in question was established, the following rules are to be applied:—

    (1) where, in spite of the lack of a holotype or lectotype or, as the case may be, of a recognisable holotype or lectotype, specialists are able to recognise the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species in question the name of that nominal species shall apply to the taxonomic species so recognised;

    (2) where specialists are agreed that the available evidence is insufficient to permit of the identification of the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species in question, the name of that nominal species is to be treated as a *nomen dubium* and therefore not available for use for taxonomic purposes;

    (3) where some but not all specialists claim to be able to recognise the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species in question or where there is disagreement among specialists as to the taxonomic species so to be recognised, the question at issue is to be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision;

(h) that the provisions now to be inserted in the *Règles* should include also the provisions embodied in the second sentence (" Un nom . . . dans les genres separés ") of the existing text of Article 31.

Substantive French text of the " Règles ": arrangements to be made for completion and promulgation

12. THE COMMISSION turned next to the proposals relating to the drafting of passages for incorporation in the substantive French text of the *Règles* for which at present only English texts existed, submitted in paragraph 19 of

Commission Paper I.C.(48)6, and to the preparation of corresponding drafts to give effect to additions and other changes agreed upon at the present (Paris) meeting, submitted in Part 2 (paragraphs 22–27) of the same Paper.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to recommend :—

(a) that the present Congress should not itself draft passages to be inserted in the substantive French text of the *Règles* either for the purpose of completing those portions for which at present only English texts existed or for the purpose of giving effect to decisions to make additions to, or changes in, the *Règles* taken by the present Congress, but, in view of the highly technical nature of the task involved in drafting such passages, should instruct the Commission as soon as possible after the close of the Congress to refer all the relevant documents to jurists, with instructions that they should prepare the draft of a revised substantive French text of the *Règles*, together with a literal translation thereof in the English language ;

(b) that, when the draft texts prepared by the jurists in accordance with (a) above were received by the Secretary to the Commission, he should forthwith communicate one copy to each Member of the Commission and to each zoologist who served as an Alternate Member thereof during the Paris Session, with a request that the Member or Alternate Member of the Commission concerned should compare the drafts with the decisions recorded in the Official Record of the Proceedings of the Commission at its Paris Session, as approved by the Congress, and should notify to the Secretary, as soon as possible and in any case within a period of three calendar months calculated from the date of despatch of the draft texts from the Secretariat of the Commission, any discrepancy or apparent discrepancy which he may have noted ;

(c) that, on the expiry of the period of three months referred to in (b) above or such earlier date by which all members of the

Commission may have furnished their comments to the Secretary to the Commission, that Officer, after such further consultations with the jurists as he may consider necessary, shall refer the comments received under (b) above to the Executive Committee of the Commission for final decision ;

(*For a later decision substituting an* ad hoc *Committee for the Executive Committee, see Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion* 5)

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 26)

(d) that, as soon as decisions have been taken by the Executive Committee on the matters referred to them under (c) above, the Secretary to the Commission should prepare for publication at the earliest possible moment an edition of the *Règles* consisting of the revised substantive French text on left-hand pages and of the corresponding literal translation into English on right-hand pages, the two texts to be printed so as to secure line for line correspondence ;

(e) that, as soon as might be practicable after the publication of the foregoing edition of the *Règles*, arrangements should be made by the Commission for the publication of editions consisting in each case of the revised substantive French text accompanied in the first case by an authoritative translation into the German language, in the second case of a translation into the Italian language and in the third case of a corresponding translation into the Spanish language ;

(2) to take note with satisfaction that, thanks partly to the financial assistance anticipated from UNESCO and partly to a special grant made by the Royal Society of London, it was intended to place the revised edition of the *Règles* on sale at a very low price.

Article 25, Proviso (a) : meaning of expression " indication " in relation to generic names

13. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a memorandum submitted by the Secretary to the Commission on the subject of the meaning, in relation to generic names, of the expression " indication " as used in Proviso (a) to Article 25 of the *Règles* (Commission Paper I.C.(48)7). Up till 1944 the general but not universal practice of zoologists had been to assume that a generic name was published with an " indication " (and therefore complied with the requirements of Proviso (a) to Article 25) if on the first publication of the generic name, previously published nominal species were cited thereunder, irrespective of whether any descriptive words characterising the genus were published at the same time. In 1944 the Secretary published a note drawing attention to the interpretation of the expression " indication " given by the Commission in their *Opinion* 1 (first published in 1907) which made it clear that this interpretation of the expression " indication " was wider than was justified by the existing law and that it was only when a genus was monotypical or was established with a designated type that a generic name given to it without any descriptive matter possessed any availability under Article 25. In order to clarify the position as regards existing practice, the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America had thereupon drawn up a questionnaire which they had distributed to a large body of representative taxonomists in the United States and the United Kingdom. This investigation had elicited 87 significant replies, of which 76 stated that the more liberal interpretation of the expression " indication " was employed in the field of the specialist consulted or was employed by that specialist in his own work or should, in his view, be employed in preference to the narrower interpretation given in *Opinion* 1. This latter interpretation was supported by only 11 of the specialists consulted. The replies showed also that in no single branch of the Animal Kingdom did a majority of the specialists consulted favour the interpretation given in *Opinion* 1, and that in this matter American and British zoologists had an identical outlook (the figures being for United States zoologists, 52 to 6 in favour of the more liberal interpretation, and for British zoologists, 24 to 5). In submitting to the Commission the replies received in answer to the questionnaire, together with a summary, of which the foregoing is an abstract, the Joint Committee had invited the Commission to amend *Opinion* 1 in such a way as to secure that a generic name published with " one or more validly named species " but without descriptive matter should be regarded as having been published with an "indication" within the meaning of Proviso (a) to Article 25.

In placing this problem before the Commission, THE ACTING PRESIDENT said that zoologists generally were under a debt of gratitude to the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America for the careful preparatory work which they had undertaken before submitting their recommendations to the Commission. That preparatory work had greatly simplified the issues involved and would correspondingly ease the task of the Commission in reaching a decision. Proceeding, the Acting President recalled that the Commission itself possessed no legislative functions; its functions were judicial and concerned therefore with the interpretation of the *Règles*; once, therefore, the Commission had given a judicial interpretation of the meaning of a given provision in the *Règles*, it was powerless, as a body, to vary that interpretation, unless it could be established that that interpretation itself was in conflict with the express provisions of the *Règles*, as, for example, it had now been agreed had been the case in the interpretation of Article 14 given in *Opinion* 8. Apart from an exceptional case of this kind, the only way to secure that a given provision of the *Règles* should bear a meaning different from the interpretation given by the Commission in an *Opinion* was to obtain from the Congress a decision to amend the provision concerned. Immediately upon the adoption of such an amendment, the earlier interpretation given by the Commission would lapse, the *Opinion* in which that interpretation had been given ceasing to have any further relevance. On receiving the application in the present matter from the Joint Committee, he, as Secretary to the Commission, had re-examined *Opinion* 1 and had come to the conclusion that no technical flaw could be detected in it. In preparing the paper now submitted, he had accordingly recommended the Commission to invite the Congress to secure the desired end by means of an express amendment of the provisions of Article 25.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting. Conclusion* 5(2))

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to recommend that Proviso (a) to Article 25 should be so amended as to secure that a generic or subgeneric name published before 1st January, 1931, shall be available under that Article as from the date of its original publication not only when (as at present) it was then accompanied by a definition or description or when the genus was monotypical or when a type species was designated or indicated by the original author when publishing the name but also when the name, on being first published, was accompanied by no verbal definition or description, the only indication given being that provided by the citation under the generic or subgeneric name concerned of the names of one or more previously published nominal species;

(2) simultaneously with the adoption of the recommendation submitted in (1) above, to cancel as being no longer applicable the interpretation of Proviso (a) to Article 25 given in Section (B)(3) of *Opinion* 1.

Status of names proposed for forms of less than subspecific rank: preliminary consideration
(*Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion* 17)

14. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the next item to be considered by the Commission was the question of the status of names proposed for forms of infra-subspecific rank. Preliminary consideration had been given to this subject by the Commission at their meeting held at Lisbon in 1935, when they had had before them a resolution on this subject adopted by the Fifth International Congress of Entomology at its meeting held in Paris in 1932. The Commission had decided at Lisbon that the time then at their disposal would not suffice to enable them to deal adequately with the problems involved in the resolution submitted by the Congress of Entomology. They had accordingly decided to invite the Secretary to the Commission to confer with specialists in representative branches of the Animal Kingdom regarding the status to be accorded to names proposed for forms of less than subspecific rank, with a view to the formulation of an *Opinion* appropriate to each of the various circumstances in which this problem arises. In accordance with these instructions, he had held extensive discussions on this subject with leading specialists in various parts of the world. Very helpful suggestions had been received from two specialist groups, namely the American Committee on Entomological Nomenclature and the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America, while among individual specialists he was particularly indebted to Dr. Charles L. Remington (U.S.A.). Valuable help had been rendered also by Professor Carlos G. Aguayo (Cuba), Professor J. C. Faure (Union of South Africa), Professor E. Gorton Linsley (U.S.A.), Dr. H. K. Munro (Union of South Africa), Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom), Dr. Curtis W. Sabrosky (U.S.A.), Dr. G. van Son (Union of South Africa) and Dr. Roger Verity (Italy), either through papers published by these authors or through correspondence. It was in the light of these and other consultations that, in collaboration with his wife, he had prepared the Report called for by the Commission at its Lisbon meeting, which he now submitted as Commission Paper I.C.(48)9. For the reasons explained in that Report, he did not consider that it would be practicable to deal with this complicated subject by way of an *Opinion*, nor would it, in his view, be correct to attempt to do so. If the matter was to be dealt with at all—and he considered it important that it should be dealt with, in view of the wide diversity of practice which existed at the present time—the proper (and the only proper) way to proceed would, in his view, be to invite the Congress to make express provision in the *Règles*. Recommendations to this end were included in the Report which he had submitted.

Continuing, THE ACTING PRESIDENT said that there was clearly not time for the Commission to examine the Report at the present meeting. It would be helpful, however, if, before the Commission adjourned, they could indicate their general attitude on the question of the procedure to be followed in dealing with the questions raised in the Report.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that in view of the importance of the question of the status to be accorded to names proposed for infra-subspecific forms, the long period during which this matter had been under consideration and the need for securing uniformity in this field of zoological nomenclature, every effort should be made to secure the approval of the present Congress for the insertion in the *Règles* of provisions dealing with this subject ;

(2) that the Report submitted by the Secretary (Commission Paper I.C.(48)9) should be placed on the Agenda of their next meeting for consideration as the first item.

Fifth Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session : time appointed

15. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to adjourn until 1430 hours on the afternoon of the same day.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned at* 1220 *hours.*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 21st–27th July, 1948

CONCLUSIONS of the Fifth Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Thursday, 22nd July 1948, at 1430 hours.

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Professor Z. P. Metcalf (U.S.A.)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor R. Spärck (Denmark)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present :

Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
Mr. C. F. dos Passos (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (U.S.A.)
Professor E. R. Hall (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*
Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer*

Status of names proposed for forms of less than subspecific rank : further consideration
(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 14)

1. THE COMMISSION resumed their consideration of the Report on the status of names proposed for forms of less than subspecific rank submitted by the Secretary to the Commission (Commission Paper I.C.(48)9), to which preliminary consideration had been given at their previous meeting. In this Report Commissioner Francis Hemming pointed out that the lowest taxonomic category recognised in the *Règles* was the " subspecies." There was considerable diversity of view regarding the way in which this expression should be interpreted in this context, some zoologists holding that this expression should be understood to have in the *Règles* the meaning commonly attached to it by taxonomists, while others argued that in the *Règles* this expression covers; or should cover, every infra-specific category and not merely *populations* which differ constantly from one another within a given species. The lack of guidance in the *Règles* on this question had led to much confusion and diversity of practice ; it was essential therefore that the Congress should agree to insert words in the *Règles* to make it clear which of the two opposing interpretations was correct.

For those zoologists who were primarily concerned with the species problem and the variation of populations within a species, there was no need for names to be given to seasonal forms and other minority elements. Indeed, from the standpoint of this group of zoologists, the giving of names to minority elements was open to strong objection, if those names possessed, or were to possess, a status co-ordinate with that of the names of subspecies and species, for in that event these zoologists would need to keep records of the thousands of names involved, in case it might be found that a name so given was the oldest available name for some subspecies or species which had not hitherto been named or which had no valid name and to ensure that names given to subspecies and species were not homonyms of names given to forms of infra-subspecific rank. On the other hand, there was a considerable body of zoologists, especially in certain groups (e.g. in some of the Orders of the Class Insecta), who were particularly interested in the study of infra-subspecific forms (seasonal, sexual, dimorphic) and individual aberrations. For this group of workers it was essential that protection should be given in the *Règles* to names proposed for infra-subspecific forms, since otherwise there would be nothing to ensure that the same form was always denoted by the same name (Law of Priority) or that the same name was always used to denote the same form (Law of Homonymy). In such circumstances, inter-communication and mutual understanding in this branch of zoology would be seriously handicapped.

It was clear therefore that no solution of the present problem would be acceptable which denied to the names of infra-subspecific units the rights conferred by the Law of Priority or excluded such names from the scope of the Law of Homonymy. It was equally clear that no solution would be acceptable which granted an absolute parity to names bestowed upon infra-subspecific forms with names bestowed upon subspecies and species. The scheme embodied in the Report was designed to meet the practical needs both of those zoologists whose requirements were such that they should have at their disposal names for taxonomic units of infra-subspecific rank and also of those zoologists for whom there was no such need.

The first essential of any scheme designed to meet this twofold need was that the *Règles* should recognise two categories of name below the category " specific name," namely " subspecific name " and " infra-subspecific name," and should give a clear definition of the meaning to be applied to each of these categories. It was suggested that for this purpose the *Règles* should define the expressions " subspecies " and " infra-subspecific form " and should provide means for determining to which of the above categories a given name should be regarded as belonging. The criterion to be adopted in applying those definitions must be objective, and it was suggested that it should depend upon the terms in which a given name was originally published. It was not possible to devise a scheme which would apply satisfactorily both to names published before the introduction of the scheme and to names published after that date, for any such scheme would be either too rigorous for names published in the earlier of these periods or insufficiently rigorous for those published in the later period. It was therefore suggested that the Congress should adopt the procedure followed for the amendment of Article 25 at Budapest and that two standards should be established, the first to apply to names published before the introduction of the scheme, the second to names published after that date. The first of these standards would be less rigorous than the second, and would admit to subspecific status a larger number of names than would the second. It was suggested also that, as in the case of the amendment of Article 25, a period of grace should be allowed before the more rigorous standard became operative. The Laws of Priority and Homonymy would apply both to names originally published as the names of subspecies and species and also to names originally published as the names of infra-subspecific forms, but these Laws would apply separately within each category, the two categories being separated from each other by a provision that, while within each category every name would be co-ordinate with every other name, a name in one category would not be co-ordinate with a name in the other. The scheme provided means for the elevation of a name published for an infra-subspecific form to be the name of a subspecies or species and for the relegation of a name published for a subspecies or species to be the name of a form of infra-subspecific rank; in the first of these cases the name would take priority only as from the date of being elevated and would be attributed to the author by whom it was so elevated, while in the second of these cases the name would retain its original priority and would be attributed to its original author. Proposals were also submitted for regulating the way in which names of either category should be designated on being first published as such and the way in which, after publication, names belonging to either category should be cited. Finally, the scheme proposed that special powers should be conferred upon the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to establish, at the request of specialists, technical designations to be used to the exclusion of all other terms to denote parallel forms occurring in allied species or their subspecies.

A general discussion took place, in the course of which the following points were raised :—

(a) It was an essential feature of any scheme under which the nomenclature of subspecies and that of infra-subspecific forms was subjected to different sets of rules that a clear definition should be given to each of these expressions. The Report proposed that, for nomenclatorial purposes, the expression " subspecies " should be defined as " a geographical, ecological or other population within a species which differs constantly from another such population within the same species." Was this definition sufficiently embracing or should it be expanded to make it clear that the expession " or other " covered populations consisting largely, though not wholly, of a form arising from a mutation ? It was generally thought that considerable difficulties would arise if express mention were to be made of populations arising from mutations in the definition of " subspecies " owing to the fact that in many cases a subjective judgment was involved in determining whether a given population had arisen in this way. It was felt therefore that it would be preferable to make no express mention of populations arising from mutations, but by leaving in the definition the words " or other," to make it possible in clear cases to bring a name given to such a population within the definition of the name of a " subspecies." Examples of the kind of case here contemplated were provided by insular faunas where it was sometimes found that a mutant form had become the sole, or virtually the sole, representative of a given species. The definition would be improved if it were reworded so as to stress the fact that its central feature was that a subspecies was a population which differed from other populations within the species, the words " geographical, ecological or other " being inserted in the definition in such a way as not to obscure this central feature.

(b) In the course of the foregoing discussion, the view was generally expressed that, if (as was ultimately agreed) no express reference to mutants were to be made in the definition of " subspecies," the reference to such forms in the definition of " infra-subspecific form " suggested in the Report should be deleted.

It would then be possible for the names given to mutant forms to be treated on their merits. If such a form constituted a population, the name given to it would rank as the name given to a subspecies, but, where such a form did not constitute a population, a name given to it would rank as a name given to a form of infra-subspecific rank.

(c) There were many populations which fully deserved to be regarded as constituting subspecies, in which, however, a minority of the individuals constituting the population concerned did not exhibit the characters which differentiated the remainder of the population from other populations within the species. It would be a mistake, therefore, to make it a condition that, in order that a name given to a population should qualify for treatment for nomenclatorial purposes as a name given to a subspecies, the population named should differ " constantly " from other populations within the species.. It was generally agreed that the word " constantly " should be deleted from the proposed definition of " subspecies."

(d) It was suggested in discussion that words should be inserted in the definition of " subspecies " which would exclude from the status of names of subspecies names given to populations which were unknown in a state of nature and had only been brought into existence in laboratory conditions. Would it not be possible to insert some such qualifying phrase as " natural " or " in nature " ? Against this view it was argued that it would be unscientific, because illogical, to stigmatise as " unnatural " a population created in laboratory conditions. The laboratory worker could to some extent control the forces of nature but he was not a magician and he was powerless to produce any effect that was contrary to nature. It was agreed that the suggestion referred to above should not be pursued.

(e) Some discussion took place regarding the rules to be adopted governing the elevation of a name from the category of " names of infra-subspecific forms " to the category of " names of subspecies." The question was asked whether it would not be possible to permit a name so elevated to retain its original priority and to be referred to its original author. Was it essential that on being so elevated a name should be treated as a new name in the realm into which it had been translated ? It was pointed out that this particular provision was a vital feature of the scheme, for it was this provision alone which made it possible for the students of species and subspecies to ignore the thousands of names given to forms of infra-subspecific rank. If this provision were to be abandoned, the scheme would be deprived of a great part of its value, for every author who described a new species or subspecies would have to take account of every name given to a form of infra-subspecific rank in the genus concerned, if he were to make sure that the name selected by himself for his new species or subspecies should not be liable to be rejected as a junior homonym if ever some name consisting of the same word which had already been given to a form of infra-subspecific rank of some species or subspecies in that genus were to be elevated to be the name of a subspecies or species.

(f) The scheme, as submitted in the Report, provided for the application within their own sphere to the names of forms of infra-subspecific rank of the Articles in the *Règles* relating to the names of species and subspecies. This was clearly an essential feature of the scheme but care would need to be taken by the jurists to ensure that this provision was not accidentally applied to Articles which by their nature were inapplicable to the names of forms of infra-subspecific rank, for example, Article 17 (which relates to the manner in which subspecific names are to be cited). Another example would be provided by the new Article, if approved, which it had been suggested should be added to the *Règles*, prescribing that the trivial name of the nominotypical subspecies of a species having two or more subspecies should consist of the same word as the trivial name of the species itself.

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion 2*)

(g) The recognition of a new category (" infra-subspecific name ") in the hierarchy of names would involve a consequential addition to Article 2.

(h) The scheme submitted in the Report contemplated the express grant to forms of infra-subspecific rank of rights under the Laws of Priority and Homonymy as between one another, though not as between the name of such a form and the name of a species or subspecies. Appropriate words would need to be added to Article 25 to cover this point. A corresponding provision would have to be inserted in Article 35 (Law of Homonymy).

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 7)

(i) At an earlier meeting it had been agreed to recommend to the Congress that a *Recommandation* should be added to Proviso (c)(1) to Article 25 laying down an ideal standard of procedure to be followed by authors when giving names to new taxonomic units. The introduction into the *Règles* of a new category (the category " infra-subspecific name") would necessitate a corresponding addition to the *Recommandation* referred to above. This should be to the effect that a description of a new form of infra-subspecific rank should include not only an absolute, but also a comparative, description of the form in question, that is, it should contain also particulars of the characters which distinguish that form from some previously described form of infra-subspecific rank in the same species or, if there was no known form with which such a comparison could be made, the characters which distingusih the new form from the general population of the species or subspecies concerned.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that the *Règles* should be modified and extended in accordance with the principles, and in the manner specified in (2) to (15) below, to give effect, subject to certain minor amendments agreed upon during the preceding discussion, to the proposals for dealing with the problem of names proposed for taxonomic units of less than specific rank set forth in the Report submitted by the Secretary to the Commission as Commission Paper I.C.(48)9 ;

(2) that, as a first step to the regulation of names given to taxonomic units of less than specific rank, words should be inserted in the *Règles* defining the expression " subspecific name " and recognising and defining the expression " infra-subspecific name " ;

(3) that, as used in connection with the foregoing categories of name, the expressions " subspecies " and " infra-subspecific form " shall have the meanings specified below :—

Expression	*Definition of expression*
" Subspecies " ...	A population (e.g., geographical, ecological) within a species which differs from any other such population within the same species.

" Infra-subspecific form "	Any form of a species other than a subspecies as defined above (e.g. seasonal forms and minority elements of all kinds within a species, such as sexual forms, transition forms, aberrations, etc.) ;

(4) that, having regard to the fact that it was not possible to devise provisions for determining whether a trivial name published for a taxonomic unit of less than specific rank was to be regarded as the trivial name of a subspecies or of an infra-subspecific form, which would be equally appropriate for trivial names published before the introduction of the new scheme and for names published after its introduction, the *Règles* should provide two standards by which such names might acquire status as subspecific trivial names, one, more lenient, to be applied to names already published, the other, more rigorous, to be applied to names published in the future ;

(5) that, in view of the need for giving adequate notice to zoologists of the new provisions before they became operative, the point of time to be specified in the *Règles* as that from which the more rigorous of the standards referred to in (4) above should be applicable should be midnight G.M.T. (Greenwich Mean Time), 31st December, 1950/1st January, 1951 ;

(6) that, in order to ensure against the risk that names intended by their authors to be the trivial names of subspecies might fail to acquire status as such on account of some technical nomenclatorial reason, care should be taken to avoid prescribing unduly detailed conditions to be complied with by names, in order that, on being first published, they should acquire the status of a trivial name of a subspecies and not merely that of a trivial name of an infra-subspecific form ; that the conditions to be prescribed should therefore represent a minimum standard ; but that, in order to provide a guide to the highest standard to be aimed at, *Recommandations* prescribing that standard should be added to the relevant new provisions of the *Règles;*

(7) that the criterion to be applied for determining whether a given trivial name was to be regarded as the trivial name of a subspecies or as the trivial name of an infra-subspecific form should be the

objective standard provided by the terms in which the name in question was originally published, and that the *Règles* should accordingly provide :—

(a) that any trivial name published, *prior to the point of time specified in* (5) *above,* as the trivial name of a taxonomic unit of less than specific rank should be deemed to have been published as the name of a subspecies or, as the case may be, of an infra-subspecific form in accordance with the following rules :—

  (i) *as the trivial name of a subspecies,* when, at the time of the original publication of the name, the author concerned either (1) clearly indicated that he regarded the taxonomic unit named as of subspecific rank or (2) did not clearly indicate the status attributed by him to the unit so named, that is to say, whether he regarded it as being a subspecies or as being an infra-subspecific form ;

  (ii) *as the trivial name of an infra-subspecific form,* only when, at the time of the original publication of the name, the author concerned expressly indicated that he regarded the taxonomic unit so named as being an infra-subspecific form ;

(b) that any trivial name published, *after the point of time specified in* (5) *above,* as the trivial name of a taxonomic unit of less than specific rank should be deemed to have been published as the name of a subspecies or, as the case may be, of an infra-subspecific form in accordance with the following rules :—

  (i) *as the trivial name of a subspecies,* only when, at the time of the original publication of the name, the author concerned clearly indicated that he regarded the taxonomic unit so named as being a subspecies ;

  (ii) *as the trivial name of an infra-subspecific form,* in all cases where, at the time of the original publication of the name, the author concerned either expressly indicated that he regarded the taxonomic unit so named as being an infra-subspecific form or, if he did not so indicate the status of the taxonomic unit concerned, where he failed to indicate clearly that he regarded that unit as being of subspecific rank ;

(8) that the *Recommandations* referred to in (6) above should strongly recommend :—

(a) that an author, when publishing a trivial name for a previously unnamed subspecies, should cite that name in a trinominal combination (consisting of (1) the generic name, (2) the specific trivial name, and (3) the subspecific trivial name) and should add, immediately after the subspecific trivial name, the expression " ssp. n." or some equivalent expression, thereby indicating both that the name is a new name and that it is intended to apply to a subspecies ;

(b) that an author, when publishing a trivial name for a previously unnamed infra-subspecific form, should (1) cite the specific name (consisting of a binominal combination of the generic name and the specific trivial name) of the species concerned or, if the form is described as a form of a subspecies only, the name of that subspecies (consisting of a trinominal combination of the generic name and the specific and subspecific trivial names of the subspecies concerned), (2) insert after the specific or subspecific trivial name, as the case may be, a comma followed by an expression indicating the status attributed to the form in question (e.g. an expression such as " form. vern.", " ♀-form," or " ab."), and (3) add the name of the new infra-subspecific form, followed by the expression " form. n." or some equivalent expression, thereby indicating both that the name is a new name and that it is intended to apply to an infra-subspecific form ;

(9) that a clear distinction should be drawn in the *Règles* between the status of a name originally published as the trivial name of a subspecies or species and that of a name originally published as the trivial name of an infra-subspecific form, and therefore that provisions should be inserted to secure :—

(a) that, while the Law of Priority (Article 25) and the Law of Homonymy (Articles 35 and 36) apply both to the trivial names of subspecies and species on the one hand and to the trivial names of infra-subspecific forms on the other hand, those Laws apply separately to each of these two categories of names, which thus constitute self-contained and mutually independent sectors of nomenclature;

(b) that (as at present) the trivial names of subspecies should be co-ordinate with the trivial names of species and *vice versa;*

(c) that the trivial name given to any infra-subspecific form be co-ordinate with the trivial names given to all other infra-subspecific forms but not with the trivial names given to subspecies and species;

(d) that a trivial name orginally published as the trivial name of an infra-subspecific form may be elevated to the status of a subspecific trivial name or of a specific trivial name by a subsequent reviser and in that event shall rank in its new status for purposes of priority as from the date on which it was so elevated and shall be attributed to the author by whom it was so elevated;

(e) that, for the purposes of (d) above, an author is to be deemed to have elevated to the status of a subspecific or specific trivial name a name originally published as the trivial name of an infra-subspecific form if he is the first author expressly to state that he is so doing or to make it clear that he regards the animal in question as representing a subspecies or species instead of an infra-subspecific form, the mere citation of the name in question in trinominal form, if unaccompanied by further evidence, not constituting evidence of elevation;

(f) that, where a name, originally published as the trivial name of an infra-subspecific form, is elevated to the status of a trivial name of a subspecies or species by a subsequent reviser, acting under (d) above, and some other author does not recognise the taxonomic validity of the action taken by the previous reviser and in consequence continues to regard the animal concerned as representative not of a subspecies or species but of an infra-subspecific form, the trivial name of that organism shall, for any such author, retain its original priority and shall be attributed to its original author ;

(g) that, where an animal which, when originally named, was treated as representing a subspecies or species, is treated by a subsequent reviser as representing a taxonomic unit of infra-subspecific rank, the trivial name originally given to that animal shall continue to be applied to it and shall in its new status retain its original priority and be attributed to its original author ;

(10) that, in order to obtain as high a degree of clarity as possible, a *Recommandation* should be added to the provisions to be inserted in the *Règles* to give effect to (9)(d) above, urging that, when an author is the first author to treat as representing a subspecies or species an animal which, when originally named, was treated as representing an infra-subspecific form, and in so doing is the first author to elevate the name originally published for that animal to the status of a subspecific or specific trivial name, that author should expressly state that he is so doing and should, as soon as possible thereafter, notify his action to a recording serial such as the *Zoological Record*, either by sending a marked copy of the paper concerned or otherwise ;

(11) that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing that, when an author cites the name of an infra-subspecific form, he should (a) cite the specific name (consisting of a binominal combination of the generic name and the specific trivial name) of the species concerned or, if the form is treated as a form of a subspecies only and not of the species as a whole, the name of that subspecies (consisting of the trinominal combination of the generic name and the specific and subspecific trivial names of the subspecies concerned), (b) insert after the specific or subspecific trivial name, as the case may be, a comma followed by an expression indicating the status attributed to the form in question (e.g. an expression such as " form. vern.", " ♀-form," or " ab.") and (3) add the name of the infra-subspecific form ;

(12) that, in view of the decision to recognise and define the new nomenclatorial category "infra-subspecific name," words should be inserted in Article 2 providing :—

  (a) that, where an infra-subspecific form is cited in relation to a species, the scientific designation of that form is a qualified trinominal, having regard to the fact that a descriptive designation is interpolated between the trivial name of the species and the trivial name of the infra-subspecific form, and thus differs from the unqualified trinominal constituted by the scientific designation of a subspecies ;

  (b) that, where an infra-subspecific form is cited in relation to a subspecies, the scientific designation of that form is a qualified quadrinominal ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 7)

(13) that, having regard (a) to the decision taken at the meeting of the Commission noted in the margin to insert a *Recommandation* to Proviso (c)(1) to Article 25, laying down the ideal procedure to be followed by authors when naming new taxonomic units, and (b) to the present decision to recognise and define the new nomenclatorial category "infra-subspecific name," words should be added to the *Recommandation* referred to above urging every author, when drawing up a description of an infra-subspecific form not only to give an absolute description of that form, but also to indicate the characters which distinguish that form from some previously described infra-subspecific form in the same species or, if there is no known form with which such a comparison could be made, the characters which distinguish the new form from the general population of the species or subspecies concerned ;

(14) that a provision or provisions should be inserted in the *Règles* applying to the trivial names of infra-subspecific forms the provisions in the *Règles* relating to the trivial names of species and subspecies, other than those provisions, which, having regard to recommendations (1) to (13) above, it would be inappropriate so to apply ;

(15) that, in order to prevent the confusion which might arise (and to remove the confusion which in certain instances had already arisen) when

different trivial names were applied to parallel infra-subspecific forms occurring in two or more allied species or their subspecies, provisions should be inserted in the *Règles* :—

- (a) empowering the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, on the application of specialists in the groups concerned, to use their plenary powers to establish technical designations to be applied to such parallel infra-subspecific forms, such designations to be exempt from invalidation under the Law of Homonymy and :—
  - (i) to consist of Latin or Latinised words or words treated as such ; and
  - (ii) to comply with the provisions in the *Règles* relating to the formation, derivation and orthography of specific and subspecific trivial names ;
- (b) prescribing that, where a given term is specified under the foregoing procedure to be the technical designation of a parallel infra-subspecific form occurring in two or more allied species, the term so specified shall have absolute priority over :—
  - (i) any trivial name which may already have been given to that form in any of the species concerned, and over
  - (ii) any other use of the same word as the name of any other infra-subspecific form of any species in the same genus or genera.

Article 2 : insertion of reference to category "subgenus"

2. In the course of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 1 above relating to the addition required to be made to Article 2 of the *Règles* consequent upon the recognition for nomenclatorial purposes of the new nomenclatorial category "infra-subspecific name," attention was drawn to the fact that the drafting of Article 2 was defective and required amendment. For although that Article purported to give a general indication of the nature of the scientific designation applicable to each of the taxonomic categories recognised for nomenclatorial purposes, it failed to make it clear that, as the category "subgenus" was an optional category, a subgeneric name, when used, was to be ignored in calculating the number of words of which a specific or subspecific name was composed. It was necessary that this ambiguity should now be removed.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in Article 2 to indicate:—

> that, as the subgenus is an optional category, the name of a subgenus, when used, is not to be taken into account when determining the number of words comprised in the scientific designation of species and subspecies and therefore that the interpolation of a subgeneric name between the generic name and the specific trivial name of a species does not, in the case of the name of a species, convert that name from a binominal into a trinominal or, in the case of the name of a subspecies, convert that name from a trinominal into a quadrinominal.

Articles 35 and 36 : problem of specific homonyms : preliminary consideration

3. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a memorandum containing proposals for the amendment of the provisions of Articles 35 and 36 in relation to specific homonyms submitted by the Secretary to the Commission as Commission Paper I.C.(48)8.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT said the question of the meaning of the provisions of the *Règles* in regard to specific homonymy had first been officially placed before the Commission by the late Professor T. D. A. Cockerell in 1937. The particular case then submitted involved the question of whether a trivial name replaced as a secondary homonym should be revived if the union of genera which had created the secondary homonymy was no longer recognised (cf. paragraphs 3 and 4 of Paper I.C.(48)8). Owing to his preoccupation at that time with the reorganisation of the Secretariat of the Commission and other matters, the Secretary to the Commission had invited President Jordan to undertake, on his behalf, a preliminary sounding of the views of the Commissioners on the question raised by Professor Cockerell. This consultation had been completed by the summer of 1939 but further progress in the matter had been interrupted by the outbreak of war in Europe in September of that year and it had not been until 1943 that it had been possible to resume work on this problem. Since that date, he (the Acting President), in his capacity of Secretary to the Commission, had given a great deal of further consideration to the matter and had received a large volume of correspondence from many different sources. In this correspondence a number of extremely helpful contributions had been received. In the first place he desired to acknowledge the valuable analysis of the problem made by Dr. Richard E. Blackwelder (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.). Interesting and suggestive points had been raised also by: Dr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (San Diego, Cal.); Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (University of California); Professor Carl L. Hubbs (University of Michigan); Dr. J. Brookes Knight (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.); Dr. E. W. Price (U.S. Bureau of Animal Husbandry); Professor Dr. Rudolf Richter (Senckenberg Institution, Frankfurt, Germany); Dr. Hobart M. Smith (University of Rochester, N.Y.). In addition, he had had extensive personal discussions with leading specialists in many countries. The visit which he had been able to pay to the United States and Canada at the end of 1947 had been of particular value in providing extensive opportunities for discussions both with organised groups of specialists and with individual workers in particular parts of the Animal Kingdom. Finally, he wished to express his grateful thanks to his wife who had worked over the whole of the material and had taken an active part in the formulation of the document now before the Commission.

Continuing, THE ACTING PRESIDENT said that from the communications which he had received and the consultations which he had held, two things had become evident: first, that the general opinion and practice of zoologists in the treatment of so-called secondary homonyms was developing and changing, second, that the original plan that the Commission should confine itself to giving an authoritative interpretation of the existing text of Articles 35 and 36 was no longer adequate to the situation and that a more radical treatment of the whole problem was needed. The need for a fresh approach was evident, both because a closer examination of Articles 35 and 36 disclosed a number of gaps and ambiguities and failed to provide answers to a number of essential questions and also because the preliminary consultations conducted by President Jordan had brought to light a fundamental confusion of two distinct questions: first, what the *Règles*, as they stand, really mean, and, second, what zoologists in general would like them to mean, which might be, and in this particular case apparently was, entirely different. This confusion no doubt arose from the unduly defeatist attitude then prevalent towards the possibility of amending the *Règles* and the conviction that the only way of securing the desired end was to persuade the International Commission to render an *Opinion* interpreting the existing provisions of the *Règles* in the desired sense, irrespective of the normal meaning of the words actually used in the Articles concerned. Such a procedure could not be regarded as satisfactory or as likely to promote the general respect and adherence which the *Règles* should command. If zoologists in general were not satisfied with the provisions of the *Règles* as they stood, it would be much better for the provisions concerned to be amended in the direction required, than for the Commission —or individual workers—to try to read into the existing words a meaning which was obviously not there at present.

The gaps and ambiguities in Articles 35 and 36 showed very clearly that the problem of specific homonymy was much more complex than the authors of the *Règles* had realised, and that any satisfactory regulation of this subject would call for provisions both more precise and more comprehensive than those embodied in the present Articles. In the paper (I.C.(48)8) which he (the Acting President) had submitted to the Commission, he had taken, as a basis of discussion, the schematic presentation of the eight major types of specific homonym which had recently been put forward by Dr. Richard Blackwelder. In order to weigh the relative advantages of the various possible solutions of the problem presented by specific homonymy, it was necessary carefully to examine the various circumstances in which a situation of homonymy might arise. In the first of the cases to be considered—Case " A "—a specific trivial name (*albus*) was published for two different species, each of which at the time that this trivial name was applied to it was referred to the genus " X " ; in this case it was assumed that the two species were still regarded by all taxonomists as congeneric. In this case, therefore, a situation of unequivocal homonymy existed from the date on which the specific trivial name *albus* was published for the second of the two species concerned. Case " B " was exactly similar to Case " A," except that at some date subsequent to the publication of the specific trivial name *albus* for the second species, either that species or the other species bearing the same specific trivial name had been removed on taxonomic grounds to another genus (genus " Y "). In Case " C " the first of the species to be described under the specific trivial name *albus* had been removed (on taxonomic grounds) from the genus " X," before the date of the description in genus " X " of the second species bearing the same trivial name (*albus*). In Case " D," the two species bearing the same trivial name (*albus*) were originally described in different genera, but before the description in genus " X " of the later of the two species to be described, the species bearing the older trivial name had been transferred to genus " X " (from genus " Y "), thus producing unquestionable homonymy. Case " E " was similar to Case " D," except that the transfer to the genus " X " of the species bearing the older trivial name took place after the date of the description in that genus of the species bearing the later-published trivial name. Cases " F," " G " and

"H" were similar to Cases "D" and "E," except that the transfer to genus "X" of the species bearing the older trivial name was temporary; in Case "F" entirely prior to, in Case "G" entirely subsequent to, and in Case "H" partly before, and partly after, the description in that genus of the second of the species to be published with the trivial name *albus*.

The Acting President went on to say that discussions of the problem of homonyms, both past and recent, had disclosed wide divergences of views and suggested that it was not likely to be possible to find any solution which would give complete satisfaction to everyone. The solution to be aimed at must satisfy, to as high a degree as possible, a number of different, and, in part, mutually inconsistent, requirements. It was the difference in weighting attributed to these conflicting *desiderata*, rather than a difference in views on the *desiderata* themselves, that was responsible for the widely divergent proposals advocated in different quarters. The principal *desiderata* which any satisfactory solution must aim to supply to the highest degree mutually compatible with one another were six in number: (1) the avoidance of the confusion which would arise if the same name were used for two different species of animals; (2) the avoidance of the confusion which would arise if one species of animal were known by two different names; (3) the avoidance of the need for unnecessary time-consuming researches into early literature; (4) the avoidance of any subjective element in the interpretation of the *Règles*, so that the trivial name which they prescribe may be independent of the taxonomic views of individual workers; (5) the avoidance of unnecessary changes in trivial names now in use; (6) the avoidance of the risk of names being unnecessarily replaced through deliberate misuse of the provisions of the *Règles*.

Although there was no mention of it in the *Règles*, a distinction had been drawn by many zoologists between *primary* homonyms on the one hand and *secondary* homonyms on the other. *Primary homonyms* were pairs of specific names consisting of combinations of a generic name and a specific trivial name identical *at the time of their original publication*. *Secondary homonyms* were all other kinds, namely pairs of identical specific trivial names which were *not* originally published in combination with the same generic name but subsequently came to be used in combination with the same generic name through the transfer of one or both of the species concerned to another genus or through the union of two or more genera. Of the eight types of homonym to which he had referred a few moments earlier, Cases

A," "B," and "C" were examples of primary homonyms, while Cases "D," "E," "F," "G," and "H" were examples of secondary homonyms.

Every zoologist would agree that, where in his judgment homonymy currently existed (e.g. in Cases "A," "D," and "E") the later published of the two identical trivial names must certainly be replaced. But there was no general agreement as to what a zoologist should do in those cases where there had at one time been homonymy but in his judgment no homonymy currently exists. The main issues on which opinions (and practice) differed were the following :—

(1) Should a *primary homonym* be replaced whenever it was discovered, or only when the condition of homonymy was considered still to exist (Case "A") but not otherwise (Cases "B" and "C")?

(2) Should a *secondary homonym* be replaced whenever it was discovered, or only when the condition of homonymy was considered still to exist (Cases "D" and "E") but not otherwise (Cases "F," "G," and "H")?

(3) If a *primary homonym* had been replaced because a condition of homonymy existed at that time, should the original name be restored later when, through the transfer of one or both of the species to another genus (or other genera) or through the subdivision of the original genus into two or more genera, the condition of homonymy was considered no longer to exist?

(4) If a *secondary homonym* had been replaced because a condition of homonymy was considered to exist at that time, should the original name be restored later when, through the further transfer of one or both of the species to another genus (or other genera) or through the subdivision of the genus in which the homonymy occurred into two or more genera, the condition of homonymy was considered no longer to exist?

The various permutations and combinations of possible answers to these questions, the Acting President pointed out, provided more than a dozen possible solutions. Of these, five only had been put forward or had received any appreciable support from zoologists. These were :—

Proposal (I). The permanent replacement of *all* homonyms whenever they were discovered (i.e. the rejection and permanent replacement of the later published of the pair of trivial names consisting of the word *albus* in Cases " A," " B," " C," " D," " E," " F," " G," and " H," whenever homonymy was discovered).

Proposal (II). The permanent replacement of all *primary* homonyms whenever discovered, combined with the temporary replacement of *secondary* homonyms only if discovered when, and for the period during which, homonymy was considered to exist (i.e. the rejection and permanent replacement of the later published of the two identical trivial names in Cases "A," "B," and "C," whenever discovered, and the temporary replacement of the later published of the two identical trivial names if homonymy was discovered during the period in which it was considered to exist, with the restoration of that trivial name when the condition of homonymy was thought no longer to exist as in Cases " G " and " H "). In Cases " D " and " E," the later published identical trivial name must necessarily be replaced after the dates on which the two species were transferred to the same genus, for in those cases the condition of homonymy was assumed to persist. In Case " F " there was no need at any stage to replace the later published of the two trivial names.

Proposal (III). The temporary replacement of both primary and secondary homonyms if discovered when, and for the period during which a condition of homonymy was considered to exist. This proposal was the same as Proposal (II), except that under it the later published of the two identical trivial names would not have to be replaced permanently in Case " B " but only during the period in which the condition of homonymy was considered to exist. It would not have to be replaced at all unless the homonymy were discovered during those years. In Case " C " the later published of the two identical trivial names would not have to be replaced at all under this Proposal.

Proposal (IV). The permanent replacement of both primary and secondary homonyms, but only if discovered during the period in which a condition of homonymy was considered to exist. This Proposal differed from Proposal (I) only by reason of the fact that the replacement of both primary and secondary homonyms would take place only if these were discovered during the period in which the condition of homonymy was considered still to exist.

Proposal (V). The permanent replacement of primary homonyms whenever discovered, combined with the permanent replacement of secondary homonyms only if these were discovered during the period in which the condition of homonymy was considered still to exist. This Proposal differed from Proposal (II) only by reason of the fact that the replacement of secondary homonyms, whenever it took place, was to be permanent.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT then said that he had listed fully the merits and demerits of each of these proposals in paragraphs 18 to 27 of the paper which he had submitted (Commission Paper I.C.(48)8) and, after setting the one against the other, had come to the conclusion that the last of these proposals was the one to be preferred, offering, as it did, in his view, the least disadvantages or disadvantages which were most amenable to remedy by other means. He asked the Commission, before proceeding further, to consider very carefully the various arguments in favour of, or against, each of the five proposals which he had outlined and to decide which of them provided the best basis for an agreed solution.

IN THE DISCUSSION which ensued, general agreement was expressed with the view that the problem of specific homonymy could not be dealt with satisfactorily by means of an *Opinion* rendered by the Commission interpreting the existing provisions of Articles 35 and 36. What was needed was the substitution for those Articles of new Articles which would set out clearly and comprehensively whatever provisions might be agreed upon for regulating this question.

The Commission turned then to consider the relative merits and demerits of each of the five main proposals which had been outlined by the Acting President, particular attention being paid to the summary of the considerations on either side given in paragraphs 18 to 27 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)8. In the course of this discussion, the following views were expressed :—

(a) *Proposal* (I) went much further than was either necessary or desirable, for it contemplated the rejection and replacement not only of trivial names which had been homonyms at the time when they were originally published or which were now regarded as homonyms, but also of every trivial name which, through carelessness, ignorance or any other cause, had ever been a homonym of some other trivial name (Cases " F," " G," and " H "). This proposal, if adopted, would cause unending trouble and confusion to the systematic worker who would need to be constantly on the watch to make sure that no author had amalgamated some genus with another and thus destroyed the validity of what had previously been a perfectly valid name. Such workers would require to make a close study of the works not only of the best authors (as at present) but also of the worst authors, for it would be mostly in the works of such authors that the lumping of taxonomically valid genera into large omnibus genera would be likely to be found. Systematic workers would also have to extend their reading to educational and semi-popular works where the nomenclature used was often extremely faulty.

(b) Whatever scheme was adopted, it should be such as to satisfy the second of the *desiderata* enunciated by the Acting President, namely that it should ensure that any given species should always have the same word as its valid trivial name, irrespective of the subjective view of taxonomists as to the genus to which that species should be referred. This consideration ruled out both *Proposal* (II) and *Proposal* (III).

(c) The choice before the Commission lay, therefore between *Proposal* (IV) and *Proposal* (V). Both these proposals secured that every species should always have the same trivial name, whatever might be the subjective views of individual workers regarding the taxonomic relationship of one species with another. The two proposals differed from one another only by the treatment proposed to be accorded to primary homonyms which, under *Proposal* (IV), would be liable to rejection and replacement on the same terms as secondary homonyms, whereas, under *Proposal* (V), they would be permanently rejected whenever discovered. The distinction between primary and secondary homonyms which lay at the basis of *Proposal* (V) was concerned with the nomenclatorial problem of homonyms in the field of nominal species, whereas *Proposal* (IV) was directed solely to the taxonomic problem of homonyms in the field of taxonomic species. The advocates of *Proposal* (IV) argued that it was sufficient to secure that every currently recognised taxonomic species had a distinct name, and considered that it was of no importance whether two nominal species were originally described under the same name in the sense of the same binominal combination, since a reference to the original author and date of publication would avoid any confusion arising therefrom. These workers argued therefore that there was no need to replace a primary homonym when the species concerned was no longer referred to the same genus as that containing the other species having an identical but earlier published trivial name. The Acting President said that he had given the most careful consideration to this proposal, which offered the advantage in some groups of reducing the number of cases in which changes of trivial names would be necessary. But, on the other hand, he was impressed by the fact that the name of the author and the date of publication did not form part of a zoological name and that it was extremely desirable that each nominal species should possess as its nomenclatorially valid specific name a binominal combination of a generic name and a specific trivial name that was unique, in the sense of not being shared with any other species. Moreover, he was impressed further by the fact that to abandon the distinction between primary and secondary homonyms would be to depart from the commonly accepted practice of zoologists. On balance, therefore, although in some cases *Proposal* (V) would involve changes in trivial names which would not be called for under *Proposal* (IV), he felt that it was to be preferred in the interests both of avoiding nomenclatorial (as contrasted with taxonomic) confusion and of securing continuity of practice. Both *Proposals* (IV) and (V) suffered from the disadvantage that they were open to abuse in the form of the deliberate creation of secondary homonyms by irresponsible or malicious revisers, but, if any such abuse were to be attempted, it could promptly be countered by the Commission employing their plenary powers to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes any book or paper in which the *Règles* were misused in this way.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to adopt *Proposal* (V) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)8, namely the permanent replacement of primary homonyms whenever discovered, combined with the permanent replacement of secondary homonyms only if these were discovered during the period in which the condition of homonymy was considered still to exist, as the basis of the new provisions relating to specific homonymy to be recommended for insertion in the *Règles* in place of the existing Articles 35 and 36.

Sixth Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session : time appointed

4. On the proposal of the Acting President, THE COMMISSION agreed :—

> to postpone their consideration of the detailed provisions required to give effect to the decision just taken in regard to the reform of the *Règles* in regard to specific homonymy until their next meeting, to be held the same afternoon at 1700 hours.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned at* 1620 *hours.*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology,
Paris, 21st–27th July, 1948

CONCLUSIONS of the Sixth Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre
Louis-Liard on Thursday, 22nd July, 1948, at 1700 hours

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor R. Spärck (Denmark)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present :

Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*
Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer*

Articles 35 and 36 : (problem of specific homonymy) : further consideration
(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 5th Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

1. THE ACTING PRESIDENT recalled that at the close of their last meeting the Commission had concluded the first part of their consideration of the problem of specific homonymy by agreeing to recommend the adoption of *Proposal* (V) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)8, namely the permanent replacement of primary homonyms whenever discovered, combined with the permanent replacement of secondary homonyms only if these were discovered during a period in which the condition of homonymy was considered still to exist, as the basis of the new provisions relating to specific homonymy to be inserted in the *Règles* in place of the existing Articles 35 and 36. It now remained for the Commission to consider the various detailed suggestions for giving effect to the foregoing decision set out in paragraphs 30 to 40 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)8 and for embodying in the *Règles* provisions relating to certain matters which were either omitted from, or were ambiguously or otherwise unsatisfactorily dealt with in, the existing text of Articles 35 and 36.

The following is a summary of the principal points which emerged in the ensuing discussion.

(A) *Need for the definition of the expressions " homonym," " primary homonym," and " secondary homonym ":* It was generally agreed that, in view of the decision to introduce into the *Règles* a distinction between the treatment of a " primary homonym " and a " secondary homonym," it was essential that, as suggested by the Acting President in Commission Paper I.C.(48)8 (paragraph 31), clear definitions of these expressions should be inserted in the *Règles*. It was felt also that it would be useful to incorporate into the *Règles* a definition of the expression " homonym " in place of the definition of homonymy given in a footnote in the present text.

(B) *Scope of the definitions to be given to the expressions " primary homonym " and " secondary homonym ":* The Acting President had suggested in Commission Paper I.C.(48)8 (paragraph 31) that, as proposed in paragraph 15 of that paper, the expression " primary homonyms " should be defined as " pairs of specific names consisting of identical combinations of generic and specific trivial names at the time of their original publication " and that the expression " secondary homonyms " should be defined as " pairs of identical specific trivial names which were not originally published in combination with the same generic name but which later came to be so combined through the transfer of one or both of the species concerned to another genus or through the union of two or more genera." These definitions had been restated in the singular in paragraph 41(7) of the same paper. The wording employed in these suggested definitions had been deliberately selected to cover two different classes of case, namely : (1) the case where two nominal species having the same specific trivial name were either originally published in, or were subsequently transferred to, the same genus ; and (2) the case where two nominal species having the same specific trivial name were originally published in different genera but through the accident of an undetected condition of generic homonymy those two genera had the same name, and the case where two nominal species having the same specific trivial name were originally published in different genera, each having a different name, but later one or both of these nominal species were transferred to another genus (or other genera) which through the accident of an undetected condition of generic homonymy had the same generic name. Clearly, the first of these classes of case must be covered by the definitions to be adopted for primary and secondary homonyms respectively, but it was not so clear that the second need be included in these definitions. The second class of case was not of great practical importance, in view of the fact that the number of occasions on which the particular situation there envisaged had actually arisen was relatively small. A provision of some sort should be included in the *Règles* to cover such cases, for otherwise authors encountering such cases would not know how to proceed. On balance, it was felt that this class of case should be covered by the definitions to be adopted for primary and secondary homonyms respectively. It was agreed therefore that the definitions to be adopted for these expressions should be framed on the lines suggested in paragraph 15 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)8.

(*For a later decision modifying this decision, see Paris Session,* 12*th Meeting, Conclusion* 28)

(C) *Essential differences between primary and secondary homonyms:* In their earlier discussion regarding the type of scheme to be adopted for regulating specific homonymy, the Commission had accepted the view that every species should possess as its nomenclatorially valid specific name a binominal combination of generic and specific trivial names which was unique, not being shared with any other species. Thus, in cases where the two species concerned were no longer regarded as congeneric, it was a purely nomenclatorial consideration which pointed to the need to reject the later published of any pair of primary homonyms. The rejection of secondary homonyms rested on an entirely different foundation, for it was the taxonomic need for ensuring that every species in a given genus should have a different specific trivial name which made it essential to reject the later published of any pair of secondary homonyms. But this was not the only difference between primary and secondary homonyms : the existence of a condition of primary homonymy between two specific names was an objectively ascertainable nomenclatorial fact, whereas a condition of secondary homonymy arose only through the application by zoologists of their subjective taxonomic ideas. In the case of primary homonyms, therefore, there was no need to provide a special procedure in the *Règles* for the rejection of the later published of any pair of primary homonyms, for such a name was invalid from the moment of its publication ; all that it was necessary to do was to provide rules for the replacement of invalid primary homonyms, when detected. The situation was quite different as regards secondary homonyms, for there was no directly objective test which could be applied to determine whether any pair of specific trivial names should be treated as secondary homonyms of one another. The provisions to be inserted in the *Règles* must prescribe a procedure which would result in a uniform nomenclature being applied by all concerned, not only by the author who rejects a specific trivial name as a secondary homonym, but also by all subsequent authors who may have occasion to refer to the species concerned. This procedure must ensure that a given species would be referred to by the same specific trivial name, irrespective of the subjective taxonomic views of the authors concerned. The rules of procedure for rejecting a specific trivial name as a secondary homonym must be sufficiently precise to secure uniformity, but care would have to be taken to avoid the insertion in the *Règles* of mandatory provisions which, by aiming at too high a standard, would have the undesired effect of invalidating on technical nomenclatorial grounds specific trivial names given in replacement of invalid secondary homonyms in a manner which would be readily understood and generally acceptable. This was the error into which the Commission and the Congress had fallen when at Budapest in 1927 they had increased the precision of certain of the provisions in Article 25, an error which at the meeting noted in the margin held during their present Session the Commission had found it necessary to redress by suggesting the insertion of a more generalised phraseology in place of portions of the text adopted at Budapest and to insert the more rigid provisions in a non-mandatory form in a *Recommandation* added to the part of Article 25 concerned. In the light of this discussion it was agreed to consider the problems involved in regulating primary homonymy, before passing to the more complex problems raised by secondary homonymy.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusions* 6, 7 & 8)

(D) *Rejection of invalid primary homonyms:* There was no need to include in the *Règles* any special procedure for the rejection of the later published of any pair of specific names which were primary homonyms of one another, for the existence of a condition of primary homonymy was a readily ascertainable objective fact and did not depend in any way upon the action of subsequent authors. All that was required, therefore, was a provision (such as that in the existing text of the *Règles*) that every such name must be rejected and that such rejection should be permanent, thus making it impossible for the rejected specific trivial name ever again to be applied to the species in question. Under this provision it would be the duty of every zoologist who encountered a situation of primary homonymy to reject the later published of the pair of specific names concerned. In order, however, to minimise the risk of the continued use of invalid primary homonyms, it was desirable that there should be added to the appropriate Article of the *Règles* a *Recommandation* strongly urging that every author who discovered that a given specific name was a primary homonym of a previously published specific name and was therefore invalid should publish a note drawing attention to this discovery and should also notify it, by sending a marked copy of the paper containing the note in question or otherwise, to a literature-recording serial such as the *Zoological Record*, so that the discovery in question might be recorded in the next issue of that serial.

(E) *Replacement of invalid primary homonyms:* It was an essential feature of any scheme for dealing with homonyms that, where a condition of homonymy was discovered, the later published of the two homonyms concerned must be rejected and be replaced by another name. In Commission Paper I.C.(48)8 (paragraphs 32 and 34) the Acting President had expressed the view that every homonym, whether primary or secondary, should, on being discovered, at once be replaced by a new name. Only in this way would it be possible to provide the nominal species concerned with a trivial name that unquestionably belonged to it. The only circumstance in which, in the scheme suggested by the Acting President, it would not be necessary to provide a new specific trivial name for the species the name of which had been rejected as an invalid homonym would be where there existed one or more other nominal species based upon the same type specimen as the nominal species the name of which had been rejected.

In the discussion which took place on this question, it was agreed that, unless a new specific trivial name was given to a species the name of which had been rejected as an invalid homonym, the nominal species concerned would remain without an objectively available trivial name of its own. For the only other course would be subjectively to identify some other nominal species with the nominal species the name of which had been rejected as a homonym and to apply to that species the specific trivial name originally published for the other nominal species. Such a procedure inevitably carried with it an element of risk, for it would automatically break down if the subjective identification of the two nominal species were later to be found to be erroneous. On the other hand, it was felt that the inclusion in the *Règles* of a provision (such as had been suggested) making it obligatory for any worker who discovered a condition of homonymy to give a new specific trivial name to the nominal species the name of which had been rejected as an invalid homonym would lead to the publication of large numbers of trivial names which would never be used for taxonomic purposes, owing to the existence of trivial names published for other nominal species which had been subjectively identified with the nominal species the name of which had been rejected as an invalid homonym. Such a procedure would add unnecessarily to the already large number of trivial names in synonymy. It was accordingly agreed that where the name of a species was found to be invalid by reason of being a homonym of a previously published name and where therefore it was necessary to provide that species with another name, this must be done by giving to that species a new name where there was no other nominal species which was either objectively identical with that nominal species, by reason of being based upon the same type specimen or was subjectively identified with the nominal species in question; that, where there existed one or more nominal species based upon the same type specimen, the oldest of the trivial names of those nominal species, if otherwise available, should be treated as being the objectively available name for the species, the name of which had been rejected; but that, where there was no nominal species based upon the same type specimen but there were one or more nominal species which were subjectively identified with the species the name of which had to be rejected as a homonym, it should be open to the author who discovered the condition of homonymy either to give a new name to the species the name of which was an invalid homonym or to apply to that species the trivial name of the nominal species which was subjectively identified with that species or, if there were more than one nominal species so identified with the species the name of which was rejected, the oldest available trivial name of any of those species. Where the author concerned elected to give a new trivial name to the species concerned, that new name would take precedence (as at present) for purposes of priority only as from the date on which it was published. It should be understood that, where the author who discovered the condition of homonymy elected not to give a new name to the species bearing the later published of the two homonymous names (preferring to apply to that species the trivial name of some other nominal species which he subjectively identified with the nominal species, the name of which had been rejected as a homonym), it would be open nevertheless to any later author, who so desired, to give a new name to that nominal species. Finally, it must be understood that where, instead of giving a new name to a nominal species, the name of which is invalid as a homonym, an author applies to such a nominal species the name of another nominal species which he subjectively identifies with the former species, the name so applied is the correct name for the nominal species in question only for so long as the two nominal species concerned are subjectively identified with one another.

(F) *Rejection of invalid secondary homonyms:* Unlike primary homonyms, secondary homonyms were necessarily subjective in origin, depending, as they did, on the subjective taxonomic views of individual revisers. In discussing this subject in Commission Paper I.C.(48)8 (paragraph 34), the Acting President had expressed the following view: "Our aim must be to avoid the confusion to which secondary homonyms may give rise, but at the same time somehow to translate their subjective origin into objective provisions which are simple to apply and are capable of being carried out in a uniform fashion by any worker, irrespective of his individual taxonomic standpoint. The provision must permit no individual discretion and must call for no laborious researches on the part of zoologists in general and must be such as to create the maximum of uniformity and stability in nomenclature. For this reason the onus of establishing the existence of secondary homonymy should be laid squarely on those from whose taxonomic judgment such homonymy arises." In other words, the question of whether a given trivial name is to be regarded as having been validly rejected as a secondary homonym must depend exclusively upon the action of the reviser responsible for its rejection, and it was this action which should determine whether or not all zoologists were to renounce permanently the use of the trivial name in question for the species concerned.

Unlike primary homonyms, secondary homonyms had in the past been treated in a far from uniform way, owing mainly to the uncertainty on the part of zoologists as to the extent to which Articles 35 and 36 were intended to apply to this class of homonym. Some zoologists had been in the habit of rejecting names as secondary homonyms, only when they themselves regarded the species concerned as belonging to the same genus as another species which had an identical, but earlier published, trivial name; other zoologists had rejected as a secondary homonym the trivia name of any species which any author had ever treated as being in the same genus as another species having an identical but earlier published trivial name, even where they themselves (the later zoologists) regarded the species as being referable to different genera. In extreme cases a trivial name had been rejected as a secondary homonym of another trivial name, where the two species had at no one time been placed in the same genus, one of the species concerned having been removed therefrom before the other was assigned to the genus. Again, some zoologists had gone so far as to reject one trivial name as a secondary homonym of another trivial name, merely because some author, without citing by name either species, had stated that he united into a single genus two genera in each of which there was in fact a species bearing the same trivial name as that of a species in the other genus. Again, there had been no uniformity in the treatment accorded to trivial names rejected as secondary homonyms, when on some later revision the two species concerned were placed in different genera ; some authors had continued to regard the rejected name as invalid, whereas others had revived that name, as soon as the condition of secondary homonymy had in their view ceased to exist.

The new provisions in the *Règles* must lay down clearly that a specific trivial name must be rejected as a secondary homonym by any reviser, when, in his opinion, two species each having the same specific trivial name were referable to the same genus. It was an essential feature of the scheme that a specific trivial name, once rejected as a secondary homonym, should never be eligible again for use for the species concerned. It was inevitable that, whatever scheme were adopted, some changes in names would be unavoidable, in view of the lack of consistency in past practice. The aim must therefore be to keep these changes within the narrowest practicable limits. It was thought that this object could best be achieved by following the procedure adopted in other cases, that is to say by prescribing two standards, one, the more rigorous, to apply to the rejection of secondary homonyms after a future date to be specified in the *Règles*, the other, less rigorous, to apply to the rejection of names prior to that date. It was thought that the point of time dividing the two periods should be the same as that selected for other similar cases, namely midnight, G.M.T. (Greenwich Mean Time), 31st December, 1950/1st January, 1951.

It was agreed that, where, *after the specified point of time*, an author rejected the trivial name of a species as a secondary homonym of the trivial name of another species, it was essential that, in order that that rejection should be effective (i.e. that it should be binding upon all other zoologists), the author concerned should be required to make it clear, first, that he himself regarded as congeneric the two species bearing identical specific trivial names, and, second, that he rejected the later published of these names as a secondary homonym of the other. As regards names rejected as secondary homonyms, *prior to the specified point of time*, it was felt that, in view of the diversity of practice in the past, the best course would be to provide in the *Règles* that a rejection of a specific trivial name as a secondary homonym of an earlier published specific trivial name should be treated as a valid rejection, even where the author who had made the rejection did not himself consider the two species concerned to be congeneric with one another. The advantage of this arrangement would be that it would provide a valid basis for the large number of rejections which had been made in the past by authors who accepted a wider interpretation of the rules than those now proposed to be prescribed and would in consequence secure validity for the large number of new names proposed by those authors as substitute names and now in common use.

(G) *Need for maximum publicity for the rejection of names as secondary homonyms:* After the new provisions came into operation (i.e. after 31st December, 1950) the rejection of a specific trivial name as a secondary homonym of another specific trivial name would have important nomenclatorial consequences, for, once a specific trivial name had been duly rejected as a secondary homonym in accordance with the provisions now to be inserted in the *Règles*, that rejection would be permanent and the rejected name could never again in any circumstances become the valid name for the species concerned. It was therefore of the highest importance to secure the maximum publicity for every rejection of a specific trivial name as a secondary homonym of another specific trivial name effected in the future, for it was only in this way that the specialists in the group concerned could be made aware of the fact that the name so rejected could never again validly be used for the species in question. It was felt therefore that it was most important that a *Recommandation* should be added to the appropriate Article dealing with specific homonymy strongly urging that every author who rejected a specific trivial name on account of secondary homonymy should notify that rejection as soon as possible after it had been published to a literature-recording serial such as the *Zoological Record*, by sending a marked copy of the paper containing the rejection or otherwise, so that the rejection in question might be recorded in the next issue of that serial.

(*For a later decision modifying this decision see Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 28)

(H) *Secondary specific homonymy arising through an undetected condition of generic homonymy:* In view of the fact that it had already been decided to include in the definition of a secondary homonym the case where such homonymy arose not only through two species bearing the same specific trivial name being placed in the same genus but also through two species bearing identical specific trivial names, though never so united, being placed in genera which through an undetected condition of generic homonymy bore the same generic name, it would be necessary so to draft the provisions relating to the rejection of specific trivial names as secondary homonyms as to cover both classes of case.

(I) *Replacement of a specific trivial name rejected as an invalid secondary homonym:* It was agreed that the rules which had already been agreed upon for the replacement of a specific name rejected as an invalid primary homonym of another specific name should be applied to the replacement of a specific trivial name rejected as an invalid secondary homonym of another specific trivial name. It was noted, however, that the rejection of a name as a primary homonym was automatic, whereas the rejection of a name as a secondary homonym was not. It would therefore be necessary, in the case of secondary homonyms, to include in the *Règles* a provision making it clear that, where, after 31st December, 1950, a new name (as contrasted with the name of some other nominal species subjectively identified with the species concerned) is given to a species on the ground that the specific trivial name of that species is an invalid secondary homonym but the author giving that name fails to make it clear both that he is of the opinion that the condition of homonymy still exists (that is to say that he regards the species in question as one of a pair of congeneric species, each bearing the same specific trivial name, and that it is for this reason that he rejects the later published of the two specific trivial names and gives a new specific trivial name to the species in question) the existing specific trivial name of that species is to be regarded as not having been validly rejected. In such a case the new specific trivial name given to that species is to have no status in zoological nomenclature.

(J) *Need for safeguards against deliberate abuse of the provisions relating to the replacement of secondary homonyms:* It was recognised that the new scheme would be liable to misuse by any malicious or irresponsible person for the deliberate purpose of creating secondary homonyms or of providing opportunities for publishing new names. It was not thought that this was a serious risk, but it was felt that it was one which should be guarded against, so far as possible. It was accordingly agreed that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* requiring the Commission to use their plenary powers to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes any book or paper in which, in their opinion, the provisions of the *Règles* in regard to the rejection and replacement of secondary homonyms had been deliberately misused for either or both of the purposes referred to above.

(K) *Status of subgeneric names in relation to specific homonymy:* Consideration was then given to the problem of the status, if any, to be accorded to subgeneric names in relation to specific homonymy, a question which had been raised by the Acting President in paragraphs 37 and 41(10) of Commission Paper I.C.(48)8. It was generally felt that, as the use of subgeneric names was optional and those names did not constitute an essential feature of the name of a species, no account should be taken of subgeneric names in determining whether a given specific name was a primary homonym of another specific name or whether a given specific trivial name was a secondary homonym of another specific trivial name. It was agreed that a provision to this effect should be inserted in the *Règles* and that for this purpose Article 6 (which lays it down that generic and subgeneric names are co-ordinate with one another, that is to say of equal value) should be amended to such extent as might be necessary.

(For a later decision modifying this decision, see Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 28)

(L) *Treatment of subspecific names in relation to specific and subspecific homonymy:* The scheme so far discussed was concerned only with the situation which arose when one specific name was a primary homonym of another specific name or when one specific trivial name was a secondary homonym of another specific trivial name. As pointed out by the Acting President in Commission Paper I.C.(48)8 (paragraphs 38–39 and 41(11)), it was necessary to insert provisions to deal also with homonymy, when this arose in connection with subspecific trivial names. It was agreed that the rules applying to cases where a pair of species having identical specific trivial names were either originally described, or were subsequently placed, in the same genus or, through the accident of an undetected condition of generic homonymy, in different genera bearing the same name should apply also to cases where of two species so described or so placed (a) the specific trivial name of one species is identical with the subspecific trivial name of a subspecies of the same or another species, or (b) the subspecific trivial name of a subspecies of one species is identical with the subspecific trivial name of a subspecies of the same or another species. Words should, however, be inserted to prevent the subspecific trivial name of the nominotypical subspecies of a species from being rejected as a homonym of the specific trivial name of that species.

(M) *The expression " of the same origin and meaning " as used in paragraph* (3) *of the existing text of Article* 35 : The Commission then turned to consider the expression " of the same origin and meaning " as used in the third paragraph of the existing text of Article 35 of the *Règles*. As pointed out by the Acting President in Commission Paper I.C.(48)8 (paragraph 40), the limitation imposed in this paragraph of Article 35 by the words quoted above made it impossible in many cases to apply the provisions of that paragraph, owing to the impossibility of determining whether any given pair of names differing from one another to the slight extent specified in that paragraph were or were not of the same origin and meaning. Even where it was possible to find an answer to this question, it was often necessary to devote a large amount of time to the study of the origin and meaning of the Latin or Latinised Greek words concerned, which could be much more profitably spent on zoological work. It was agreed to recommend that the expression "of the same origin and meaning" should be deleted from the Article which would replace the third paragraph of the existing Article 35 and that in its revised form the provision now embodied in that paragraph should merely lay it down that any pair of trivial names (whether specific or sub-specific) which differed from one another only by the differences in spelling specified in that paragraph were to be treated as homonyms of one another.

(For a later decision qualifying this decision, see Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 43)

At the conclusion of the foregoing discussion, THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

(1) that the present Articles 35 and 36 should be deleted from the *Règles* and that there should be inserted in their place Articles giving effect to the provisions specified in (2) to (21) below;

(2) that, as a first step towards the regulation of homonyms, words should be inserted in the *Règles* defining the expression "homonym" and expressly recognising the existence for nomenclatorial purposes of two types of specific homonym, to be known as "primary homonyms" and "secondary homonyms" respectively, these expressions to be defined as follows:—

Expression	*Definition of expression*
"Homonym"	Where the same name is applied to two different units belonging to the same taxonomic category, for example, to two different genera or two different species, each of the names so used is a "homonym" of the other.
"Primary homonym"	Where two species at the time of the original publication of their names are placed in the same genus or are placed in different genera which, through the accident of an undetected condition of generic homonymy, bear the same name, and each species is given the same specific trivial

(For a later decision modifying this decision, see Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 28)

name, each of the specific names (binominal combinations of a generic name and a specific trivial name) so published is a "primary homonym" of the other specific name.

"Secondary homonym" Where two species which at the time of the original publication of their names are placed in different genera and are given the same specific trivial name are later placed in the same genus or are placed in different genera which, through the accident of an undetected condition of generic homonymy, bear the same name, each of the specific names so formed is a "secondary homonym" of the other specific name.

(*For a later decision, modifying this decision, see Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 28*)

(3) that a specific name which is the later published of a pair of specific names which are primary homonyms of one another is to be treated as having been invalid as from the date of its publication and is to be permanently rejected ;

(4) that, in order to minimise the risk of the continued use of invalid primary homonyms, a *Recommandation* should be added to the appropriate Article of the *Règles* strongly urging that every author who discovers that a given specific name is an invalid primary homonym of another specific name should publish a note drawing attention to this discovery and should notify it to a literature-recording serial such as the *Zoological Record*, by sending a marked copy of the paper containing the note, or otherwise, so that the discovery in question may be recorded in the next issue of that serial ;

(5) that, when the specific name (binominal combination of a generic name and a specific trivial name) of a nominal species is found to be an invalid primary homonym and, in consequence, that name (hereinafter referred to as the "rejected name") is permanently rejected, the name to be applied to that nominal species shall be determined in accordance with the rules specified below :—

(a) where there exists a nominal species (i) which possesses an available name and is based upon the same type specimen as the nominal species bearing the rejected name and (ii) which has as its specific trivial name a name different from that comprised in the rejected name (such a nominal species being hereinafter referred to as an "objectively substitutable nominal species "), the objectively available specific name of the nominal species bearing the rejected name shall be the specific name borne by the objectively substitutable nominal species, and that name shall take precedence under the Law of Priority as from the date on which it was first published ;

(b) where there exist two or more objectively substitutable nominal species, the objectively available specific name of the nominal species bearing the rejected name shall be the first published of the specific names of any of the objectively substitutable nominal species concerned and shall take precedence in like manner as specified in (a) above ;

(c) where there exists no objectively substitutable nominal species, as aforesaid :—

  (1) the author discovering the condition of primary homonymy may either give to the nominal species bearing the rejected name a new specific name consisting of a binominal combination of a generic name and of a specific trivial name different from that comprised in the rejected name, the specific name so given becoming the objectively available specific name of that nominal species and taking precedence under the Law of Priority as from the date on which it was so published, or

  (2) if from the subjective taxonomic standpoint of the author discovering the condition of primary homonymy, there is no need to give a new specific name to the nominal species bearing the rejected name, that author may elect to leave that nominal species without an objectively available specific name of its own, it being understood in such a case that it shall be open at any later date for the same or any other author to give to that nominal species a new specific name comprising a specific trivial name different from that comprised in the rejected name, the specific name so given thereupon becoming the objectively available specific name of that nominal species and taking precedence under the Law of Priority in like manner as specified in (1) above ;

(6) that the specific trivial name to be applied to the taxonomic species represented by a nominal species bearing a rejected name (as defined in (5) above) shall be determined in accordance with the Law of Priority, that is to say :—

(a) where there exist one or more nominal species which are either (i) objectively substitutable nominal species (as defined in (5) (a) above) or (ii) nominal species bearing available names comprising specific trivial names different from that comprised in the rejected name referred to above, which is, or which are, subjectively identified with the nominal species bearing the rejected name (such a nominal species being hereinafter referred to as a " subjectively substitutable nominal species "), the specific trivial name properly applicable to the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species bearing the rejected name shall be the first published of the specific trivial names of any of those nominal species, provided that, if that name is the name of a nominal species which is subjectively but not objectively a substitutable nominal species, that name shall cease to be the specific trivial name properly applicable to that taxonomic species, if later, and for so long as, the nominal species to which that name was originally given ceases to be subjectively identified with the nominal species bearing the rejected name;

(b) where there exists neither an objectively nor a subjectively substitutable nominal species, the nominal species bearing the rejected name is to be given a new specific name comprising a specific trivial name different from that comprised in the rejected name, the specific trivial name so given becoming thereupon the name properly applicable to the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species bearing the rejected name for so long as no subjectively substitutable nominal species having an earlier published name is subjectively identified as also representing that taxonomic species;

(7) that, where a specific name is the later published of a pair of secondary homonyms, the trivial name concerned is to be rejected by any author who is of the opinion that the condition of homonymy still exists, that is to say, if he regards the two species as being congeneric with one another, but in no other circumstances;

(8) that, where, prior to midnight G.M.T. (Greenwich Mean Time), 31st December, 1950/1st January, 1951, an author makes it clear that he rejects a specific trivial name on the ground that it is part of the later published of a pair of secondary homonyms, that rejection is to be accepted as valid, irrespective of whether the author makes it clear that he himself considers that the condition of homonymy still exists, that is to say, whether he regards the two species as congeneric with one another;

(9) that, where, subsequent to the point of time specified in (8) above, an author rejects a specific trivial name on the ground that it is part of the later published of a pair of secondary homonyms, that rejection is to be accepted as valid, only if the author in question makes it clear (a) that he regards as congeneric the two species bearing identical specific names and (b) that he rejects the later published of these names as an invalid homonym of the other;

(10) that a specific trivial name rejected under either (8) or (9) above is never to be used again for the same species;

(For a decision reversing the decision here recorded, see Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 28)

(11) that such adaptations should be made in (7) to (10) above as may be necessary to make those provisions apply not only to the case where a pair of secondary homonyms occur in a single genus but also where a pair of secondary homonyms occur through the fact that a given specific trivial name is used for one species in one genus and also for another species in a different genus, which, through the accident of

an undetected condition of generic homonymy bears the same generic name as that of the genus to which the other species is referred ;

(12) that, in view of the importance of securing that, whenever the specific trivial name of a species was duly rejected, in accordance with (7) above, as part of an invalid secondary homonym of the specific name of another species, the fact that that name had been so rejected should be brought prominently to the notice of interested specialists, in order to minimise the risk of the continued use of that name in contravention of the provisions of (10) above, a *Recommandation* should be added to the appropriate Article of the *Règles* strongly recommending that every author who rejects a specific trivial name as part of an invalid secondary homonym should notify that rejection as soon as possible after its publication, to a literature-recording serial such as the *Zoological Record*, by sending a marked copy of the paper containing that rejection or otherwise, so that the rejection in question may be recorded in the next issue of that serial ;

(13) that, when the specific name (binominal combination of a generic name and a specific trivial name) of a nominal species is found to be an invalid secondary homonym and in consequence the specific trivial name comprised in that specific name (hereinafter referred to as the "rejected trivial name") is permanently rejected in accordance with the provisions of (7) above, the specific trivial name to be applied to that nominal species shall be determined in accordance with the rules specified below :—

(a) Where there exists an objectively substitutable nominal species (as defined in (5) above, the objectively available specific trivial name of the nominal species bearing the rejected trivial name shall be the specific trivial name borne by the objectively substitutable nominal species, and that name shall take precedence under the Law of Priority as from the date on which it was first published ;

(b) Where there exist two or more objectively substitutable nominal species, the objectively available specific trivial name of the nominal species bearing the rejected trivial name shall be the first published of the specific trivial names of any of the objectively substitutable nominal species concerned and shall take precedence in like manner as specified in (a) above ;

(c) where there exists no objectively substitutable nominal species, as aforesaid :—

(1) the author discovering the condition of secondary homonymy may either give to the nominal species bearing the rejected trivial name a new specific name consisting of a binominal combination of a generic name and a specific trivial name different from the rejected trivial name, the specific trivial name so given becoming the objectively available specific trival name of that nominal species and taking precedence under the Law of Priority as from the date on which it was so published, or

(2) if, from the subjective taxonomic standpoint of the author discovering the condition of secondary homonymy, there is no need to give a new specific name to the nominal species bearing the rejected trivial name, that author may elect to leave that nominal species without an objectively available specific name of its own, it being understood in such a case that it shall be open at any later date for the same or any other author to give to that nominal species a new specific name comprising a specific trivial name different from the rejected trivial name, the specific trivial name so given thereupon becoming the objectively available specific trivial name of that nominal species and taking precedence in like manner as specified in (1) above;

(14) that the specific trivial name to be applied to the taxonomic species represented by a nominal species bearing a rejected trivial name (as defined in (13) above) shall be determined in accordance with the Law of Priority, that is to say :—

(a) where there exist one or more nominal species which are either (i) objectively substitutable nominal species (as defined in (5) above) or (ii) subjectively substitutable nominal species (as defined in (6) above), the specific trivial name properly applicable to the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species bearing the rejected trivial name shall be the first published of the specific trivial names of any of those nominal species, provided that, if that name is the name of a nominal species which is subjectively but not objectively a substitutable nominal species, that name shall cease to be the specific trivial name properly applicable to that taxonomic species, if later, and for so long as, the nominal species to which that name was originally given ceases to be subjectively identified with the nominal species bearing the rejected trivial name.

(b) where there exists neither an objectively nor a subjectively substitutable nominal species, the nominal species bearing the rejected trivial name is to be given a new specific name comprising a specific trivial name different from the rejected trivial name, the specific trivial name so given becoming thereupon the name properly applicable to the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species bearing the rejected trivial name for so long as no subjectively substituable nominal species having an earlier published name is subjectively identified as also representing that taxonomic species.

(15) that, when, after the point of time specified in (8) above, a new specific name is given to a nominal species on the ground that

the specific name of that nominal species is an invalid secondary homonym but the author who gives the new name fails to make it clear both that he is of the opinion that the condition of homonymy still exists, that is to say that he regards the species in question as one of a pair of congeneric species, each bearing the same specific name, and that it is for this reason that he rejects the later published of the two specific trivial names and gives a new specific trivial name to the species in question, the existing specific trivial name of that species is to be regarded as not having been validly rejected and in consequence the new specific trivial name given to that species is to have no status in zoological nomenclature;

(16) that, in order to minimise the risk of the foregoing provisions relating to specific homonymy being abused by irresponsible or malicious persons for the deliberate purpose of creating secondary homonyms or of providing opportunities for publishing new names, a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* requiring the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use their plenary powers to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes any book or paper, in which, in their opinion, the provisions of the *Règles* in regard to the rejection and replacement of secondary homonyms had been deliberately misused for either or both of the purposes referred to above;

(17) that provisions should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that subgeneric names are to be disregarded for the purpose of determining whether a given specific name is a primary homonym of another specific name or whether a given specific trivial name is a secondary homonym of another specific trivial name, and that Article 6 should be amended to such extent as may be necessary for this purpose;

(18) that the provisions in the *Règles* relating to cases where a pair of species having identical specific trivial names were either originally described, or were subsequently placed, in the same genus or, through the accident of an undetected condition of generic homonymy, in different genera bearing the same generic name, should apply also to cases where of two nominal species so described or so placed (a) the specific trivial name of one species is identical with the subspecific trivial name of a subspecies of the other species or (b) the subspecific trivial

(For a later decision modifying this decision, see Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 28)

name of a subspecies of one species is identical with the subspecific trivial name of a subspecies of the same or of another species, save that nothing in the foregoing provisions should be held to invalidate the subspecific trivial name of the nominotypical subspecies of a species having two or more subspecies on the ground thatt hat name is the same as the specific trivial name of the species itself;

(For a later decision qualifying this decision, see Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 43)

(19) that there should be omitted from the provision which is to replace the third paragraph of Article 35 (which prescribes that certain trivial names which differ from one another only in the ways there specified are to be treated as homonyms of one another), the condition that such names must be of the same origin and meaning and that the opening words of the new provision should be drafted so as to provide merely that within a given genus any pair of trivial names (whether specific or subspecific) which differ from one another only by the differences in spelling specified in that paragraph are to be treated as homonyms of one another.

Need for publicity for new names and for selections of type species of genera

2. During the discussion recorded in Conclusion 1 above, THE COMMISSION had under consideration recommendations submitted by the Acting President in Commission Paper I.C.(48)8 (paragraphs 33, 34, 41(13)) in favour of the insertion in the *Règles* of a *Recommandation* to be attached to the appropriate Article strongly recommending that every author who publishes a new specific name in replacement of an invalid primary homonym or a new specific trivial name in replacement of an invalid secondary homonym should notify the publication of that name to the *Zoological Record* or other literature-recording serial, so that the new name so published might be recorded in the next issue of that serial. At the same time the Acting President had suggested that this *Recommandation* should be so drafted as to apply not only to names published in replacement of invalid homonyms but also to all names published for new species.

In the ensuing discussion general agreement was expressed with the proposal submitted but it was felt that the procedure suggested should apply not only to new specific and subspecific names but also to new names of all taxonomic categories recognised by the *Règles*, that is to say, at one end of the scale to the names of new Families, Sub-families, genera and sub-genera, and at the other end of the scale to the names of infra-subspecific forms. The view was expressed also that it was highly desirable that a corresponding *Recommandation* should be added to Article

30, strongly recommending that every author who selects a nominal species to be the type species of a nominal genus should notify that selection to a literature-recording serial with a view to its being recorded in the next issue of that serial.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

Publicity for new family and sub-family names

(1) that a *Recommandation* should be added to Article 4 strongly urging that every author who establishes a new Family or a new Sub-family should notify the establishment of that Family or Sub-family as soon as possible after the publication of the paper in which it is established, to a literature-recording serial such as the *Zoological Record*, by sending a marked copy of the paper concerned or otherwise, in order that the name of the new Family or Sub-family, as the case may be, may be recorded in the next issue of that serial ;

Publicity for new generic, subgeneric specific, subspecific, and infra-subspecific names

(2) that a *Recommandation* should be added to Article 25 strongly recommending that every author who publishes a new generic or a new subgeneric name, either as the name of a new genus or subgenus or in replacement of a generic or subgeneric name which is invalid as a homonym or who publishes a new name for a species, subspecies or infra-subspecific form or who elevates to specific or subspecific rank a name originally published for an infra-subspecific form or who publishes a name to replace a specific, subspecific, or infra-subspecific name which is invalid as a homonym should notify the publication or, as the case may be, the elevation, of that name as soon as possible after its publication to a literature-recording serial such as the *Zoological Record*, by sending a marked copy of the paper concerned or otherwise, so that that new name or, as the case may be, that elevation of the status of a name may be recorded in the next issue of that serial ;

Publicity for the selection of the type species of genera established prior to 1st January 1931

(3) that a *Recommandation* should be added to Article 30 strongly recommending that every author who selects a nominal species to be the type species of a nominal genus established prior to 1st January, 1931 should notify that type selection as soon as possible after its publication to a literature-recording serial such as the *Zoological Record*, either by sending a marked copy of the paper concerned or otherwise, so that that type selection may be recorded in the next issue of that serial.

Definition of the expressions "specific name" and "specific trivial name"

3. In the course of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 1 above, it became evident that (as pointed out by the Acting President in paragraph 30 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)8) any consideration of the problem of specific homonymy involved both the concept of the binominal combination which constitutes the scientific designation of a species and also the concept of that portion of that designation which distinguishes a given species from all other species in the same genus. In the existing text of the *Règles* both these concepts were referred to under the expression *nom spécifique* (specific name). In order to put an end to the confusion so caused, it was essential that in the revised text of the *Règles* these concepts should be distinguished from one another by means of clearly defined expressions. The distinction between these concepts and the need for a definition of each had been recognised by Linnaeus himself who had applied the expression *nomen specificum* to designate the binominal combination which constitutes the scientific designation of a species and the expression *nomen triviale* for the portion of the scientific designation of a species which distinguishes the species concerned from every other species in the same genus.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, in order to put an end to the present state of confusion, it was essential that the *Règles* should distinguish clearly between the binominal combination which constitutes the scientific designation of a species and the second term of such a combination, which distinguishes a given species from every other species referred to that genus ;

(2) to recommend :—

  (a) that, in order to give effect to the considerations specified in (1) above, words should be inserted in the *Règles* expressly recognising the two concepts referred to above, the first of these to be designated by the expression "specific name", the second by the expression "specific trivial name" ;

  (b) that the foregoing expressions should be defined in the *Règles* as follows :—

Expression	*Definition of expression*
"Specific name"	The binominal combination of a generic name and a specific trivial name which constitutes the scientific designation of a species.

"Specific trivial name"	The second term of the binominal combination which constitutes the scientific designation of a species, being the portion of that designation which distinguishes the species concerned from every other species referred to the genus concerned.

(*c*) that, wherever the expression " specific name " is used in the *Règles* in the sense not of a " specific name ", as defined in (b) above but in the sense of a " specific trivial name ", as there defined, the latter expression should be substituted for the former.

Definition of the expressions " subspecific name " and " subspecific trivial name "

(*Previous reference : Paris Session, 5th Meeting, Conclusion* 1 (2) *and* (3))

4. In the course of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 3 above, it was pointed out that there was an ambiguity in the use in the *Règles* of the expression " subspecific name " exactly parallel to the ambiguity already noted in the case of the expression " specific name ". As it had now been decided to eliminate the ambiguity in the case of the latter expression, it followed that it would be necessary to take corresponding action in regard to the expression " subspecific name ".

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that words should be inserted in the *Règles* distinguishing clearly between the trinominal combination which constitutes the scientific designation of a subspecies and the third term of such a combination, which distinguishes a given subspecies of a particular species from every other subspecies of that species, the first of these concepts to be designated by the expression " subspecific name ", the second by the expression " subspecific trivial name " ;

(2) that the foregoing expressions should be defined in the *Règles* as follows :—

Expression	*Definition of expression*
"Subspecific name"	The trinominal combination of a generic name, a specific trivial name and a subspecific trivial name which constitutes the scientific designation of a subspecies.
"Subspecific trivial name"	The third term of the trinominal combination which constitutes the

scientific designation of a subspecies, being the portion of that designation which distinguishes the subspecies concerned from every other subspecies of the species in question.

(3) that, wherever the expression " subspecific name" is used in the *Règles* in the sense not of a " subspecific name ", as defined in (2) above, but in the sense of a " subspecific trivial name ", as there defined, the latter expression should be substituted for the former.

Specific trivial names always to be published in connection with generic names

5. In the course of the discussion on the replacement of secondary homonyms recorded in Conclusion 1 above, the view was expressed that care should be taken to make it absolutely clear in the *Règles* that, when a new specific trivial name was published in substitution for a specific trivial name that had been rejected on account of secondary homonymy, the new name so published must, in order to be an available name, be published, if not in actual combination with a generic name, at least in connection with such a name. There were cases in the literature where this had not been done and where in consequence it was necessary to infer from the context the name of the genus to which the author of the new specific name intended to refer the species in question. It was pointed out that it was not only in connection with new specific trivial names published in substitution for invalid secondary homonyms that there existed this risk, for there were cases in the literature in which an author, either not knowing, or being doubtful regarding, the genus to which he should refer a new species which he was describing, had published a specific trivial name for that species without indicating any generic name for it.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* making it clear that no specific trivial name published either for a previously undescribed species or in substitution for a specific trivial name rejected as an invalid homonym possesses any status in zoological nomenclature, unless the author concerned specifies a generic name in connection therewith.

Co-ordination of the Laws of Priority and Homonymy

6. During the discussion recorded in Conclusion 1 above regarding the status of a new name published in substitution for an invalid homonym (whether primary or secondary), attention was drawn to the fact that the present text of the *Règles* was defective in that the Articles dealing respectively with the Law of Priority (Article 25) and the Law of Homonymy (Articles 34–36) appeared to have been drawn up entirely independently of one another with the result that each lacked a qualifying reference to the other. It was pointed out on the one hand that in addition to the existing provisions in Article 25 that Article should contain a provision that the oldest published name for a genus, subgenus, species, subspecies or infra-subspecific form would not be the valid name of the genus, subgenus, species, subspecies or infra-subspecific form concerned if it was a name which was invalid under the Law of Homonymy (at present dealt with in Articles 34–36). Similarly, in the Articles which would replace Articles 34–36 in the revised text of the *Règles*, it would be necessary to make it clear that a name which does not satisfy the Law of Priority does not invalidate, under the Law of Homonymy, a later-published name consisting of the same word.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to co-ordinate the Law of Priority (Article 25) and the Law of Homonymy (Articles 34-36) with one another, this object to be attained by inserting in :—

(a) the Article dealing with the Law of Priority a provision that, even if a name satisfies all the requirements specified in Article 25, that name is not a valid name if it falls to be rejected under the Law of Homonymy ;

(b) the Articles dealing with the Law of Homonymy a provision that a name which does not satisfy the Law of Priority does not invalidate, under the Law of Homonymy, a later-published name consisting of the same word.

Application to generic names of the provisions in the third paragraph of Article 35 relating to specific trivial names (*Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 14)

7. In the course of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 1 above regarding the provision relating to the rejection on account of homonymy of a specific trivial name which differed from another specific trivial name only in any of the small points of spelling listed in the third paragraph of the existing text of Article 35, THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reminded the Commission that by a decision taken at their Session held at Lisbon in 1935 the Commission had given an interpretation of Article

34 applying, *mutatis mutandis*, to generic names the provisions in regard to specific trivial names referred to above. That decision had later been formally embodied in the Commission's *Opinion* 147. In view of the decision just taken by the Commission to recommend the deletion from the third paragraph of Article 35 of the words " of the same origin and meaning ", it followed automatically that a corresponding amendment should now be made in *Opinion* 147. The Commission had however already agreed at their present Session to incorporate in the *Règles* provisions embodying the interpretations of existing Articles given by the Commission in interpretative *Opinions* and they would shortly be considering the paper (Commission Paper I.C.(48)11) which had been submitted by himself on this subject. The Acting President suggested that the most convenient course might be for the Commission to confine itself to taking note that *Opinion* 147 now required amendment but to defer taking a decision in regard to that amendment until they came to consider the question of incorporating into the *Règles* the interpretation given in that *Opinion*.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 4(2) (a))

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, if the Congress approved the recommendation which it had been agreed to submit for the amendment of the third paragraph of Article 35 relating to homonomy in specific trivial names by the deletion of the qualifying words " of the same origin and meaning ", it would be necessary to ensure that simultaneously with the adoption of that amendment, a corresponding amendment should be made in *Opinion* 147, in which the foregoing paragraph of Article 35 had been applied to generic homonymy (Article 34) ;

(2) to defer further consideration of this question until they came to consider the proposals for incorporating into the *Règles* the interpretations thereof given in interpretative *Opinions* rendered by the Commission submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 41)

Thanks of the Commission to Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

8. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to place on record their grateful thanks to Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming for the active part which, in conjunction with her husband, Secretary Francis Hemming, she had played in preparing the proposals submitted to the Commission in regard to the problem of specific homonymy (Commission Paper I.C.(48)8) and the nomenclature of infra-specific forms (Commission Paper I.C.(48)9).

MRS. HEMMING thanked the Commission for the resolution which they had just adopted.

Codification of the interpretations of the "Règles" given in " Opinions " rendered by the Commission : future procedure in regard to

9. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission on the need for the codification of the interpretations of the *Règles* given in *Opinions* rendered by the Commission in their judicial capacity (Paper I.C.(48)10).

(*Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 15)

In introducing this subject, THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that many important interpretations of the *Règles* had been given by the Commission in *Opinions* rendered at various times since 1907, the year in which the International Congress of Zoology had conferred upon the Commission the right and the duty to render *Opinions* on questions of zoological nomenclature submitted to them. Many of these interpretations had been given incidentally in *Opinions* dealing with the status of particular names and it was therefore not surprising that some of them had been widely overlooked. At their meeting held in Lisbon in 1935 the Commission had reviewed their practice in this matter and had agreed that, when in future they reached a decision of interest to the general body of zoologists, that decision should be presented in such a way as to ensure that it was most readily available to all concerned. The revised procedure then agreed upon had been consistently followed in all subsequent *Opinions*. It represented a substantial improvement on previous practice, but nevertheless it touched only the fringe of the problem. Much more drastic action would be needed in order to put an end to the chaotic situation which confronted zoologists who desired to ascertain whether any particular provision of the *Règles* had been the subject of an interpretative *Opinion* rendered by the Commission. When during the war the Commission had taken stock of the problems which they would need to tackle immediately the war was over, they had included in their programme the publication of an authoritative edition of the substantive French text of the *Règles*, and the reissue of their earlier *Opinions* which had long been out of print and were virtually unobtainable. The Commission had then proposed to attach to the proposed edition of the *Règles* an analysis of those of their *Opinions* which contained interpretations of provisions in the *Règles*. The preparation of this analysis, which had occupied over two years, had proved laborious and difficult owing largely to the need to distinguish carefully between the actual decisions taken by the Commission on the one hand, and on the other the numerous *obiter dicta* embodied in the texts of many *Opinions* which had the appearance of being views expressed by the Commission but were in fact no more than the personal views of the draftsmen of the *Opinions* concerned. Simultaneously with the preparation of the foregoing analysis of the *Opinions* rendered by the Commission, a start was made with the re-publication of the older *Opinions*. This was long overdue, for owing to these *Opinions* having been for so long out of print, they were known to the majority of zoologists only through their "summaries" which often failed to give a clear picture of the decision taken in those cases where the ostensible object of the *Opinion* was to give a ruling on the status of some particular name, while by far the most important part of the *Opinion* was the decision taken on the interpretation of some provision of the *Règles*. Attached to each of the *Opinions* so re-issued were editorial notes prepared by himself (the Acting President) in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission. Both the projected analysis of the interpretative *Opinions* and the publication of an annotated edition of the older *Opinions* represented steps in the right direction, but each fell short of the ideal solution, for neither the analysis nor the annotations to the older *Opinions* could in the circumstances do more than represent the views of the author by whom they were compiled. Obviously, it would be much more satisfactory if means could be found to secure in these matters an authoritative pronouncement made, on the advice of the Commission, by the Congress itself.

The Acting President went on to say that within the last 18 months the whole question had been carefully reviewed and the conclusion had been reached that the right and proper course would be to take advantage of the meeting in Paris of the International Congress of Zoology to seek the concurrence of the Congress in a comprehensive codification of the interpretative *Opinions* rendered by the Commission during the last 40 years. Periodical codifications of this kind were a normal feature in the development of law in countries in which the law consisted partly of statute law and partly of case law built up from interpretative decisions taken by the Courts. Only by this means was it possible to prevent the law from becoming unduly difficult to interpret and in the course of time so complicated and obscure as almost to defy interpretation. Fortunately the *Règles* had not yet reached that stage but signs were not wanting that the *Règles* and the *Opinions* taken together were becoming so complicated as to make their interpretation by working zoologists unnecessarily time-consuming and burdensome. From the consultations which had taken place on this matter it was evident that a codification of the kind proposed would be widely welcomed by zoologists. Once the proposed codification had been carried through, zoologists would be able not only to see what was the present state of the law but also to determine much more easily than was at present possible the directions in which further developments or amendments were required.

Vitally important as it was that order should be introduced into the *Règles* by the codification of the interpretative *Opinions* rendered by the Commission, it was equally essential that the Commission should never again permit a recurrence of the present state of confusion. It was accordingly suggested that, when in future the Commission were called upon to give an interpretation of a given provision of the *Règles*, they should not only do so in the most categorical and unambiguous terms but should also so draft the interpretation so given that it could readily be written into the *Règles* at the next meeting of the International Congress. The consistent application of this principle would secure that the current authorised edition of the *Règles* would contain provisions on all matters on which interpretative judicial decisions had been taken by the Commission up to and including the last meeting of the Congress. In order to ascertain the state of the law, a zoologist would therefore only have to consult the *Règles* and such few interpretative decisions as the Commission might have rendered since the last Congress. The Acting President added that, in order to facilitate reference to interpretative decisions of this kind, it was proposed that in future *Declarations* should be reserved for recording this type of decision, decisions relating to the status of individual books and of individual names, together with decisions relating to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" being recorded, as at present, in *Opinions*.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusions* 3 & 5).

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 6)

The Commission had already noted that in three cases at least interpretations given in *Opinions* were manifestly incorrect and the Commission had agreed to cancel the *Opinions* in question (*Opinions* 20, 37 and 8). In another case the Commission had agreed to recommend that a particular provision of the *Règles* (Article 25, Proviso (c) (2)) should be amended and in consequence an *Opinion* (*Opinion* 138) giving an interpretation of the passage now to be deleted from that Article had become inappropriate and misleading. In this case also the Commission had agreed to cancel the *Opinion* in question. *Opinions* containing interpretations of the *Règles* would be in a different position after those interpretations had been written into the *Règles* as the result of the proposed codification. Such *Opinions* would no longer be an authorised source to which zoologists could look for interpretations of the *Règles*, since for this purpose those *Opinions* would have been superseded by the new provisions inserted in the *Règles*. It was desirable, however, that such *Opinions* should remain on record for historical purposes, but it was essential that it should be made clear that every such *Opinion* was repealed for interpretative purposes. Where an *Opinion* contained both an interpretation of the *Règles* and also a decision regarding the status of a particular book or a particular name, that *Opinion*, though repealed in so far as it contained an interpretation of the *Règles*, would remain in full force, so far as the decision in regard to a particular book or a particular name was concerned.

(*For later decisions on this subject, see Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 31 ; 12*th Meeting, Conclusion* 19)

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) *as regards "Opinions" already rendered by the Commission* (*i.e. Opinions* 1—194) :—

(a) to cancel any *Opinion* :—

(i) which might be found to contain an erroneous interpretation of a provision in the *Règles*, the said cancellation to become operative forthwith ;

(ii) which contained an interpretation of a provision of the *Règles* which, though correct under the existing text of the *Règles*, would cease to be correct as soon as the present (Paris) Congress had approved the recommendation to be submitted to them for the amendment or deletion of the provision interpreted in the *Opinion* in question, the said cancellation to become operative as from the date on which the amendments to the *Règles* made by the present Congress came into force ;

(b) to repeal for interpretative purposes any *Opinion* or part of an *Opinion* containing an interpretation of a provision of the *Règles*, where the present Congress decided to incorporate that interpretation, in whole or in part, in the text of the *Règles*, the said repeal to become operative as from the date on which the amendments to the *Règles* made by the present Congress come into force ;

(c) to request any zoologist who might consider that any *Opinion*, other than an *Opinion* that had been cancelled or an *Opinion* repealed for interpretative purposes under (a) or (b) above, contained an interpretation of the *Règles* on a matter not expressly dealt with therein which through inadvertence had either not been incorporated in the *Règles* as part of the present codification or had not been expressly repealed for interpretative purposes, to notify the Commission as soon as possible, so that they might consider what recommendation in regard thereto to submit to the next meeting of the Congress ;

(d) to place on record their intention :—

(i) to make proposals to the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress for the incorporation in the *Règles* of any interpretation thereof given in any *Opinion* rendered prior to July 1948 which they might find was inadvertently not incorporated in the *Règles* by the present Congress and which they might deem expedient should be so incorporated ;

(ii) to repeal for interpretative purposes every *Opinion* rendered prior to the above date which might not already have been either cancelled or repealed for interpretative purposes under (a) or (b) above, the said repeal to become operative as from the date on which the amendments to the *Règles* made by the next Congress came into force ;

(2) *as regards "Declarations" and "Opinions" rendered after the close of the present Congress* :—

(a) to reserve the series entitled *Declarations* for the recording of interpretations of provisions of the *Règles* and the consequent submission of proposals for the amendment of the *Règles* and the series entitled *Opinions* for decisions relating to the status of individual books and of individual names, together with decisions relating to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology";

(b) to lay it down that the decision given in any *Declaration* or *Opinion* is to be looked for only in the "summary" of that *Declaration* or *Opinion*, that every such "summary" is to be rigidly construed, and that no deductions, other than those expressly specified therein, are to be drawn therefrom;

(c) to place on record that no new interpretation of any provision of the *Règles* is to be drawn from any *Opinion*, every such interpretation to be recorded in a *Declaration*, as provided in (a) above;

(d) to report to each meeting of the Congress any interpretations of provisions of the *Règles* which they may have given in a *Declaration* or *Declarations* rendered since the last previous meeting of the Congress, with a recommendation that every such interpretation be incorporated forthwith in the *Règles*;

(e) to repeal for interpretative purposes any *Declaration*, the contents of which shall have been incorporated into the *Règles* by direction of a meeting of the Congress, acting on a recommendation submitted to it in accordance with (d) above, the said repeal to become operative as from the date on which the amendments to the *Règles* made by that Congress shall come into force;

(3) to incorporate into the By-Laws of the Commission the provisions specified in (2) above.

Interpretations of provisions in the "Règles" given in "Opinions": proposals for incorporation in the "Règles" to be considered item by item

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 4 (2) (a))

10. THE COMMISSION had before them a memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission containing detailed proposals for the codification of the interpretations of various provisions in the *Règles* given by the Commission in *Opinions* rendered at various dates from the year 1907 onwards (Commission Paper I.C.(48)11).

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) recalled that, since Commission Paper I.C.(48)11 had been prepared, they had agreed in principle

at the meeting noted in the margin to recommend the incorporation in the *Règles* of provisions embodying the interpretations of existing Articles given by the Commission in *Opinions* already rendered, subject to such modifications or exceptions as they might consider proper ;

(2) agreed to examine Commission Paper I.C.(48)11, paragraph by paragraph, with a view to reaching conclusions regarding the recommendations to be submitted in this regard.

Article 4 and "Opinion" 141 (Family names)

11. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 4 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 141 and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraphs 1-3 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

In the discussion on this question it was generally agreed that the existing provisions (Articles 4 and 5) in regard to Family and Sub-Family names constituted a totally inadequate treatment of this complicated problem. It was not possible on the present occasion to study this matter in the requisite detail but it was very desirable that the issues involved should be thoroughly investigated as soon as possible.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that the Secretary to the Commission should be invited to make a thorough study, in consultation with interested specialists, of the problem of the nomenclature of Super-Families, Families, Sub-Families and Tribes and to submit a Report thereon, with recommendations, for consideration by the Commission at their meeting to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress, with a view to the submission by the Commission of proposals for the insertion in the *Règles* of comprehensive provisions dealing with this subject ;

(2) that, without prejudice to (1) above :—

(a) words should be inserted to make it clear :—

(i) that the genus bearing the oldest available generic name in a family need not be taken as the type genus of a family ;

(ii) that an author establishing a new family is free to select as the type genus of that family whatever genus he considers the most appropriate ;

(iii) that the name of a family is to be based upon the name of its type genus, and that the selection of a given generic name to be the basis of a family name constitutes *ipso facto* a definite designation of the genus bearing that name to be the type genus of that family. Example: The genus *Musca* Linnaeus, 1758, was definitely designated as the type genus of the family MUSCIDAE by reason of the fact that the stem of the word " Musca " was used as the basis of that family name.

(iv) that the provisions of (i) to (iii) above are to apply to the names of sub-families in like manner as to the names of families ;

(b) a *Recommandation* in the following sense should be added to the provision specified in (a) (ii) above : " The genus selected to be the type genus of a family should, so far as possible, be a well-known and common genus and one which, from the taxonomic standpoint, occupies a central position in the family so established."

(c) a *Recommandation* in the following sense should be added to the provision specified in (a) (iii) above : " Where a well-established family name has not been formed in accordance with (iii) above but where it would be undesirable to change existing practice, authors should, before making any such change, refer the question to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for such action as it may think proper."

Article 8 and " Opinion " 183 (generic names to be published in the nominative singular)

12. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 8 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 183 and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 4 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that the provision in Article 8 that a generic

(Later reference : Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion 7)

name is to consist of a noun in the nominative singular requires that no name is to be accepted as a generic name until it has been published as a noun in the above case and number and that a noun first published in some other case or number is available as a generic name only as from the date on which it is for the first time published in the nominative singular and is to be attributed to the author by whom it is first so published.

Article 14, first paragraph, and " Opinion " 64 (single letters not eligible as trivial names)

13. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of the first paragraph of Article 14 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 64 and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 5 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that a single letter, such as " a ", " b ", " c ", etc. is not to be accepted as the trivial name of a species or subspecies.

Status of specific trivial names when preceded by serial letters or serial numerals at the time of their original publication

14. In the course of the discussion (recorded in Conclusion 13 above), regarding the codification of the interpretation of Article 14 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 64, attention was drawn to the fact that, where an author, in giving a list of the species which he referred to a given genus, had placed a serial letter or a serial numeral immediately in front of the trivial name of the species concerned, some later authors had sought to argue that, in the case of any new name published in this manner, the serial letter or the serial numeral, as the case might be, should be regarded as forming part of the trivial name.

(Later reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 32)

In order to eliminate discussion on this contention, which was clearly misconceived, it would, it was felt, be helpful if words were inserted in the *Règles* making it clear that serial letters and serial numerals, when used in the manner indicated above, do not form part of the trivial name of the species concerned.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted at some appropriate point in the *Règles* making it clear that, where a new specific trivial name is published in a list of species referred to a given genus and is there preceded by a serial letter or serial numeral, that serial letter or serial numeral is not to be taken as constituting part of the specific trivial name in question.

Article 19 and " Opinions " 26, 27, 29, 36, 41, 60, 61 and 63 (emendation of names)

15. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretations of Article 19 of the *Règles* given in *Opinions* 26, 27, 29, 36, 41, 60, 61, and 63, and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraphs 7-9 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

In the discussion on this question, the following points were made :—

(a) In various respects the interpretation of Article 19 had been rendered more, rather than less, difficult by the *Opinions* given by the Commission at various times, for some of those *Opinions* were irreconcilable both with the terms of Article 19 itself and with the interpretation of that Article given in other *Opinions.*

(b) It was evident that, before a satisfactory solution could be reached in regard to the complex of problems raised by this Article, a much closer study than any hitherto attempted would need to be made. Further, this study would need to be directed to the substantive French text of this Article, rather than to the imperfect English translation of that text commonly in use, to which most of the discussions hitherto had been directed.

(c) Various proposals had been received for making changes in Article 19, but it was very difficult to judge the merits of these proposals until the present meaning of that Article had been clarified by the incorporation into it of such of the interpretations given by the Commission in *Opinions* on particular cases as were consistent with the meaning of the words actually used in the Article itself. The consolidation of the present law in this matter was thus an indispensable preliminary to the consideration of its development or reform.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that the Secretary to the Commission should be invited to make a thorough study, in consultation with interested specialists, of the problems involved in the emendation of scientific names which, when originally published, contained errors of transcription or of orthography or printers' errors and to submit a Report thereon, with recommendations, for consideration by the Commission at their meeting to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress, with a view to the submission by the Commission of proposals for the insertion in the *Règles* of comprehensive provisions dealing with this subject ;

(2) that, without prejudice to (1) above :—

(a) words should be inserted in Article 19 to make it clear that, in determining whether, as regards any given name, an error of transcription or of orthography or a printers' error is "évident" in the original spelling of a scientific name, particular attention should be paid to evidence contained in the book or paper in which the name was first published ;

(b) it should be made clear in Article 19 in some manner which will not detract from the generality of the expression "évident" as used in that Article that the following examples illustrate cases where the original spelling of a name should be emended :—

(i) Where it is evident that a generic name or a specific trivial name is based upon a personal name and where the spelling of the scientific name so published is not identical, except for the termination used, with the correct spelling of the name of the person to whom the genus or species is dedicated, the spelling of the scientific name in question is to be emended so as to correspond with the correct spelling of the name of that person. Example : The names *Ruppelia* Swainson, 1839, and *Rupellia* Swainson, 1839, are to be emended to *Rüppellia*, in view of the fact that this genus was dedicated to a zoologist named Rüppell.

(ii) When an author founds a new name upon one or more Greek words but inadvertently commits an error in transliterating into the Latin alphabet one or more of the Greek letters of which the word was (or the words were) composed, the error of transcription is to be corrected. Example : The inadvertent mistransliteration of the Greek letter Zeta committed in the spelling "Pentoxocera", a name formed from the Greek words πέντε (five), ὄζος (branch), and κέρας (horn), is to be corrected and the spelling of this name is to be emended to " Pentozocera ".

(iii) When an author founds a new name upon one or more Greek words cited in the original publication of the name and when one of those words is there incorrectly spelt and in consequence the scientific name founded thereon is also incorrectly spelt, the spelling of that name is to be emended. Example : The authors of the generic name which was originally published as " Athlennes " stated that that name was based upon a Greek word similarly spelt (i.e. a word having the Greek letter Theta as its second letter). In fact, however the Greek word concerned had as its second letter the Greek letter Beta. The spelling of this generic name is therefore to be emended to " Ablennes ".

(iv) When an author founds a trivial name upon the locality or district from which the type specimen was obtained but, as the result of his misreading or miscopying the name of the locality or district from the label on the type specimen, publishes as the trivial name of the species a Latinised word which fails to indicate the locality or district intended, the spelling of the name so published is to be emended. Example : When Günther gave to a new fish the name *Leuciscus hakuensis*, he selected that trivial name because he had misread as " Lake Hakou " the locality of the type specimen of this species. In fact, however, the name of the type locality was " Lake Hakone ". In these circumstances, the trivial name *hakuensis* is to be emended to *hakonensis*.

(v) When an author, in naming a new species, selects for its trivial name a word which, though adjectival in form, is not a recognised Latin adjective and where that author uses for the nominative singular of that word the termination " -ius " (masculine) or " -ia " (feminine), these terminations are to be corrected to " -eus " and " -ea " respectively. Example : The word " iridia " (published by Gibbons in 1855 as a new trivial name in the combination *Salmo iridia*), though adjectival in form, is not a recognised Latin adjective. This trivial name is, therefore, to be emended to *irideus* (masculine), *iridea* (feminine), or *irideum* (neuter).

Article 25 and " Opinion " 2 (status of a name based on a hypothetical form)

16. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 25 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 2 (which relates to the status of a name based upon a hypothetical form) and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 10 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that a name based upon a hypothetical form has no status in zoological nomenclature. Example : The generic name *Pithecanthropus* Haeckel, 1866, being the name of a genus based upon a hypothetical species, has no status in zoological nomenclature and does not preoccupy the generic name *Pithecanthropus* Dubois, [1894], the name of a genus based upon a known species.

Article 25 and " Opinion " 49 (status of a specific name published conditionally)

17. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 25 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 49 (which relates to the status of a specific name published conditionally) and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 11 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(a) that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where an author doubtfully identifies known material with a described species but publishes for that material a new specific name for use therefor if later it is found that that material is referable to an unnamed species, the specific name, given conditionally in this manner, is available for that species as from the date of its original publication and is to be attributed to its original author. Example: The specific name *Siphonophora asclepiadifolii*, given conditionally by Thomas in 1879 to known material which he doubtfully identified with a previously named species (*Aphis asclepiadis* Fitch) is available as from 1879 for the material so named by Thomas.

(b) that a *Recommandation* should be inserted at an appropriate point in the *Règles* strongly deprecating the publication of names conditionally.

Article 25 and "Opinion" 4 (status of a manuscript name on being first validly published with an "indication")

18. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 25 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 4 (which relates to the status of a name which, prior to being published, was a manuscript name) and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 12 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 15)

It was pointed out in discussion that the expression "printed in connection with the provisions of Article 25" used in *Opinion* 4 was not happily chosen: (1) because it prejudged the question whether, in order to be accepted, a book containing new names must be actually printed, as contrasted with being reproduced by some other process (a subject on which proposals would be submitted to the Commission at a later meeting during its present Session), and (2) because it was difficult to regard a manuscript name rejected by the author by whom it was first published as the name by which the genus or species concerned had been first designated (". . . . sous lequel ils ont été le plus anciennement designés") as prescribed in the opening words of the Article. What was intended was, no doubt, that a manuscript name, to become available, must first be published ("divulgué dans une publication") in conditions which satisfied the requirements of the provisos to Article 25. It would be well to make this clear, now that the decision in this *Opinion* was to be incorporated in the *Règles*.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 28)

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that a manuscript name acquires status in zoological nomenclature only when it is validly published and, on being so published, is published in conditions which satisfy the requirements of the provisos to Article 25, and that the status of a manuscript name, so published, is not affected by the question whether the author by whom it is published accepts it as an available name or sinks it as a synonym.

Article 25 and " Opinions " 87, 59, and 190 (various aspects of the problem of publication)

19. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretations of aspects of the problem raised by the expression " divulgué dans une publication " as used in Article 25 given by the Commission in *Opinion* 87 (which relates to the status of a name when it appears for the first time in a proof sheet) in *Opinion* 59 (which relates to the status of a name which first appears in an advance separate) and in *Opinion* 191 (which relates to the status of a name when it appears for the first time in documents, etc., distributed by an author to colleagues or students), together with the proposals thereon submitted in paragraphs 15, 17 and 14 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

(For a later decision amplifying the present decision, see Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion 15)

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear :—

(a) that the distribution of proof sheets does not constitute publication and that a new name given currency in this way has no status in zoological nomenclature until such later time as it is duly published in accordance with the provisions of Article 25 ;

(b) that, where a new name appears in a paper published in a book or serial and separates of that paper are distributed in advance of the publication of the paper concerned, the new name ranks for the purposes of the Law of Priority not from the date of the distribution of the separates but from the later date on which the paper was actually published either in that book or serial or elsewhere.

(c) that a new name introduced in a note (whether printed or otherwise reproduced) in explanation of a photograph or other illustration of an animal is not " divulgué dans une publication " where the author concerned does no more than distribute copies of such a note and photograph or other illustration to colleagues or students or when he merely attaches copies of such a note and illustration to separates of a paper dealing with the same subject but either not containing the new name in question or containing it without satisfying the requirements of Article 25. Example: The specific name *Rhynchonella alta* has no status under the Law of Priority as from the date (about 1878) on which it appeared in a note with accompanying photograph distributed by Samuel Calvin but ranks for purposes of priority as from 1890 when it was published with an indication by H. S. Williams.

Articles 30 and 35 and "Opinion" 148 (status and type species of a generic name published as an invalid emendation of an earlier name)

20. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretations of Articles 30 and 35 of the *Règles* given in paragraph (1) of *Opinion* 148 (which relates to the status of a generic name published as an invalid emendation of, or as a substitute for, an earlier generic name of the same origin and meaning) and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraphs 16 and 26 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

It was pointed out that the decision given in the *Opinion* referred to above carried with it the corollary that, if a generic name which had been invalidly emended was later rejected as an invalid homonym, the invalid emendation of that name becomes an available name for the genus concerned, as from the date on which it was originally published. In the example given in *Opinion* 148, *Achatinus* de Montfort, 1810, was rejected as a synonym of *Achatina* Lamarck, 1799, of which it was an invalid emendation. Like any other synonym, *Achatinus* de Montfort would become an available name for the genus concerned, if it were to be found that the earlier name (*Achatina* Lamarck, 1799), of which it had been sunk as a synonym, was an invalid homonym. The decision in this part of *Opinion* 148 was subject to the limitation imposed by *Opinion* 147 (proposals for the incorporation in the *Règles* of which were submitted in paragraph 41 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11) that the original name and the invalidly emended version should not be so similar to one another in spelling as to fall within the categories of names which, under that *Opinion*, were to be treated as homonyms of one another. It was pointed out also that, in view of the decision taken earlier during the present meeting to recommend that the phrase "of the same origin and meaning" should be deleted from the third paragraph of Article 35 (which relates to specific homonymy, that phrase (which had been introduced into *Opinion* 148 by analogy from Article 35) should be omitted in the proposed incorporation in the *Règles* of the decision given in paragraph (1) of *Opinion* 148.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 1(21)

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear :—

(a) that a generic name published as an invalid emendation of an earlier name (an emendation made otherwise than in accordance with Article 19) is to be rejected as a synonym of the earlier name, where that name is an available name, the type species of the later published nominal genus being automatically the same species as the type species of the earlier published nominal genus ;

(b) that, where the name of a genus is rejected as an invalid homonym and the next oldest name is a name published as an invalid emendation of that name and that invalid emendation is sufficiently different in spelling from the original name not to be a homonym thereof under the provisions contained in the third paragraph of Article 35 as applied to Article 34 by *Opinion* 147, the generic name originally published as an invalid emendation becomes an available name for the genus in question and has priority as from the date on which it was first published as an invalid emendation and is to be attributed to the author by whom it was so published.

Article 25, Proviso (a), and " Opinion " 1 (meaning of the expression " indication ")

21. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Proviso (a) to Article 25 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 1 (which relates to the meaning of the expression " indication " as used in the Proviso in question), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 18 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

In the discussion on this proposal, it was pointed out that, since the foregoing paper had been prepared, the Commission had decided to recommend the liberalisation of the third of the provisions relating to generic names specified in *Opinion* 1. It remained now to consider the codification (and to such extent as might be necessary, the clarification) of (1) the remaining portion of *Opinion* 1 as regards generic names, and (2) the whole of the portion of that *Opinion* which was concerned with specific trivial names, and the concluding sentence of that *Opinion*, which referred both to generic names and to specific trivial names. In the decision to be taken on these matters it would be necessary to make it clear that the whole of the interpretation of the expression " indication " here under consideration related only to names published prior to 1st January, 1931, the date on which the more rigorous provisions of Proviso (c) to Article 25 came into operation.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear, as regards generic names and specific trivial names published prior to 1st January, 1931 :—

(a) that a specific trivial name is to be accepted as having been published with an " indication " if it is published (i) with a bibliographical reference to a previously published definition or description, or (ii) in conjunction with a figure (illustration), or (iii) as a substitute for a previously published name which is invalid as a homonym ;

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 29)

(b) that a generic name is to be accepted as having been published with an " indication " if it is published (i) with a bibliographical reference to a previously published definition or description, or (ii) in the manner agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, or (iii) as a substitute for a previously published name which is invalid as a homonym ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 13)

(c) that neither a reference to a museum label nor to a museum specimen nor to a vernacular name is to be accepted as an " indication " either for a generic name or for a specific trivial name.

Article 25, Proviso (a), and " Opinion " 43 (status of a new specific name published jointly with a new generic name and *vice versa*)

22. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Proviso (a) to Article 25 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 43 (which relates to the status of a new specific name published jointly with a new generic name), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 19 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, a new nominal species was described in a new nominal genus and the genus and species concerned were described jointly, no separate description being given for either, the joint description so given is to be accepted as an " indication " both for the new generic name and for the new specific name.

Article 25, Proviso (a), and "Opinion" 52 (significance of the citation of a type locality in an original description)

23. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Proviso (a) to Article 25 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 52 (which relates to the significance to be attached to the citation of a type locality in the original description of a new species) and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 20 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that the citation of a type locality unaccompanied by any other particulars, does not constitute an "indication" for the purposes of Proviso (a) to Article 25.

Article 25, Proviso (b), and "Opinion" 5 (status of a name originally published before 1758 when re-published after 1757)

24. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Proviso (b) to Article 25 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 5 (which relates to the circumstances in which a name originally published before the starting point of zoological nomenclature in 1758 (Article 26) is to be accepted as an available name on being republished after the close of 1757), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 21 in the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that a name which, by reason of having been published before the starting point of zoological nomenclature (i.e. prior to 1st January, 1758), possesses no status under the *Règles* does not acquire such status if, when republished after 1757, it is simply reprinted with its original diagnosis, it being necessary, if such a name is to acquire rights under the *Règles*, that, on being republished, it should be reinforced by being adopted or accepted by the author by whom it is republished.

Article 26 and "Opinion" 3 (relative status of works published in the year 1758)

25. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 26 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 3 (which relates to the status to be accorded to works published in the year 1758), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 24 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that any work published in the year 1758 is to be treated as having been published subsequent to the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* of Linnaeus and therefore subsequent to the starting point of zoological nomenclature.

Articles 25 and 31 and " Opinion " 88 (status of a specific name published for a composite nominal species)

26. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 88 (which relates to the status of the name of a nominal species, the original description of which contained descriptions of the bodily parts of more than one species and to the status of the name of a genus having such a nominal species as its type species), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 25 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

In the discussion on this matter, it was pointed out that *Opinion* 88 was silent regarding the Article or Articles of which it gave an interpretation. This was a question which must, however, be determined before the ruling given in this *Opinion* could be incorporated in the *Règles*. Although, at first sight, this *Opinion* appeared to be concerned with the question of the availability of certain classes of names, it was evident on closer inspection that the main purpose of the *Opinion* was first to lay down the proposition that the name of a nominal species based on the description of parts of different animals belonging to more than one species was an available name in the same sense that the name of a composite nominal species based upon two or more taxonomic species was an available name but, like such a name, was indeterminate until the appropriate steps had been taken under the *Règles* to determine the identity of the taxonomic species to which the name should adhere. The problem here concerned was therefore one relating to Article 31. The second issue raised by this *Opinion* was the status of a generic name, in a case where the type species of the genus concerned was, when first published, a nominal species which was taxonomically indeterminate by reason of being based upon more than one taxonomic species. In such a case it would clearly be necessary to apply the procedure laid down in Article 31, thereby establishing the identity of the nominal species concerned, before it would be possible to determine the identity of a genus having such a nominal species as its type species. The *Règles* contained provisions for determining the identity of a genus based on two or more species (Article 30) and for determining the identity of a composite nominal species based on two or more taxonomic species (Article 31). It was perhaps a weakness in the *Règles* that there was not also a provision, which would appropriately form part of Article 25, expressly laying it down that the name of a nominal species is not invalidated by reason of that species being, when first published, a composite species consisting of two or more taxonomic species. The incorporation of the ruling given in *Opinion* 88 provided a convenient opportunity for the insertion of such a provision. There was clearly no need to incorporate in the *Règles* any provision relating to the status of a generic name in a case where the type species was, when first published, an indeterminate composite nominal species, for once it was made clear that the name of such a nominal species was an available name and it was clearly laid down how the identity of such a composite species was to be determined, there could be no doubt as to the status of the name of a genus having such a species as its type species.

At the conclusion of the discussion, THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that a provision should be inserted at some appropriate point in the *Règles* making it clear that a specific name is not invalidated by reason of the fact that, in the original description of the nominal species to which that name was applied, there were included descriptions either of two or more species or of parts of different animals belonging to two or more species ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

(2) that words should be inserted in the revised text which it had been agreed should be inserted in the *Règles* in place of the existing Article 31 to make it clear that the provisions of that Article applied not only to the case where the original description of a nominal species contained descriptions of two or more species but also to the case where the original description of such a species contained descriptions of parts of different animals belonging to two or more species.

Article 30, Rule (a), and " Opinion " 7 (type species of a genus the name of which was published with the formula " n.g., n.sp. ")

27. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (a) in Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 7 (which relates to the question of the type species of a genus established prior to 1st January, 1931, with the formula " n.g., n.sp."), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 27 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

The attention of the Commission was drawn to the fact that, although the obvious intention of the Commission in *Opinion* 7 was to lay down that, in the case of a genus with no designated type species, where the expression " n.g., n.sp." was used in relation to one but not more than one of the included species, that species was to be taken as the type species, the wording actually used in that *Opinion* applied also to the case where the foregoing expression was used in relation also to two or more species. In such a case the *Opinion* became meaningless, for it was impossible for a genus to have more than one species as its type species. It was important that, when this *Opinion* was codified, it should be made clear that the decision given in it applied only to the case where the expression "n.g., n.sp." was used in relation to one but not more than one species.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, the name of a nominal genus was published without a designated or indicated type species, but the formula "n.g., n.sp." or an exactly equivalent formula was employed in relation to that nominal genus and to one but not more than one new nominal species described thereunder, the employment of such a formula is to be taken as constituting the designation of the nominal species in question as the type species of the nominal genus concerned.

Article 30, Rule (c), and "Opinion" 47 (type species of a genus for which only one nominal species is cited by the original author)

28. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (c) in Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 47 (which relates to the type species of a genus which was not intended by its original author to be monotypical but for which only one species was definitely cited by name at the time of the original publication of the generic name), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 28 in the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where a genus is established without a designated or indicated type species and only one nominal species is cited as being referable to that genus, the nominal species so cited is the type species of the genus by monotypy, irrespective of whether or not the author concerned regarded the genus as monotypical.

Article 30, Rule (d), and "Opinion" 18 (type species of a nominal genus, an included nominal species of which has

29. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (d) in Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 18 (which relates to the questions whether it is necessary that, in order that the type species of a genus

a synonym possessing a tautonymous trivial name not cited in the original publication)

shall be determined by absolute tautonymy, the tautonymous specific or subspecific trivial name must actually be cited in the original publication of the generic name), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 29 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, a genus was established with no designated or indicated type species and one of the included nominal species had at that time either as its valid name or as a synonym a specific trivial name consisting of the same word as the generic name or had a subspecies the subspecific trivial name of which consists of such a word, it is immaterial for the purposes of Rule (d) in Article 30 whether the tautonymous specific or subspecific trivial name was or was not cited in the original publication of the generic name.

Article 30, Rule (d), and " Opinion " 16 (type species of a nominal genus of which an included nominal species had a pre-1758 tautonymous univerbal specific name cited as a synonym)

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 27)

30. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (d) in Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 16 (which relates to the type species of a genus established without a designated or indicated type species but containing a species for which a pre-1758 univerbal specific name consisting of the same word as the generic name is cited as a synonym), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 30 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

The attention of the Commission was drawn to the fact that the wording employed in *Opinion* 16 suffered from a defect similar to that which had already been noted in *Opinion* 7. In the present case the Commission had clearly intended to lay down a rule that, where a genus established without an expressly designated type species had among its originally included species one for which a particular type of synonym was cited at the time of the original publication of the generic name, that species was to be treated as being the type species by absolute tautonomy. As drafted, however, *Opinion* 16 applied also to the case where there were two or more originally included species for each of which a synonym of the special kind envisaged was cited. In such a case the ruling in *Opinion* 16 became meaningless, for no genus could have more than one species as its type species. In this case also it was important that, on codification, it should be made clear that the decision applied only to the case where one but not more than one of the originally included species was distinguished by having among its cited synonyms a synonym of the special kind dealt with in this *Opinion.*

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, a genus was established without a designated or indicated type species and where in the synonymy cited for one, but not more than one, of the included nominal species there was cited a name which, prior to 1758, had been published as a univerbal specific name and that name consists of the same word as the name of the new genus to which the species in question was referred, the nominal species under which the pre-1758 tautonymous univerbal specific name was cited as a synonym is the type species of the genus by absolute tautonymy.

Article 30, Rule (f), and " Opinion " 35 (type species of a substitute genus where one or more of the originally included species were not cited under a binominal name)

31. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (f) in Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 35 (which relates to the species eligible for selection as the type species of a genus established as a substitute genus, where either genus when originally established contained species which are recognisable but which were not on that occasion cited under binominal names), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 31 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, a generic name was published as a substitute for another generic name and where no type species had been designated, indicated, or selected for either of the nominal genera so named, any of the species cited in the original publication as referable to the genus bearing the older name, as well as any of the species cited in the original description of the genus having the substitute name, where some or all of these are different, is eligible for subsequent selection by the same or another author as the type species of the genus having the substitute name (and therefore as the type species of the original genus) and that for this purpose it is not necessary that the species so selected should have been cited under a binominal name when originally cited either in the original genus or in the genus established in substitution therefor.

Article 30, Rule (g), and " Opinion " 35 (type species of a nominal species where one or more of the originally included species

32. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (g) in Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 35 (which lays down for Rule (g) a proposition similar to that which it lays down for Rule (f) as regards the

were not cited under a binominal name)

eligibility of a species not originally cited under a binominal name for selection by a subsequent author as the type species of a genus), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 32 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, a genus was established without a designated or indicated type species, any of the species originally included in the genus is eligible for subsequent selection by the same or another author as the type species of the genus, irrespective of whether or not that species was cited under a binominal name at the time of the original publication of the generic name.

Article 30, Rule (g), and " Opinion " 10 (type species of genera having identical limits)

33. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (g) in Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 10 (which relates to the type species of genera established with identical limits), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 33 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, two or more genera with identical limits (i.e. with the same included nominal species) were formed independently by different authors and neither genus or none of the genera had a designated or indicated type species, any of the included nominal species may be subsequently selected by the same or another author to be the type species of either or all of the genera concerned.

Article 30, Rule (g), and " Opinion " 62 (a nominal species eligible for selection as the type species of more than one nominal genus)

34. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (g) in Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 62 (which lays down the proposition that a nominal species which is the type species of one genus is not thereby excluded from selection to be the type species of another genus), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 34 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that in the case of a genus established prior to 1st January, 1931, without a designated or indicated type species, any author may later select to be the type species of that genus any of the originally included

nominal species, irrespective of whether the nominal species so selected may already be the type species of another nominal genus.

Article 30 and "Opinion" 164 (type species of a genus not affected by the subjective union of that genus with another genus)

35. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 164 (which lays it down that the type species of a genus is not subject to change upon the union of the genus concerned with another genus), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 35 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, when two or more genera are subjectively united on taxonomic grounds, such union in no way affects the type species of the genera concerned, the combined genus so formed taking as its name the oldest available name of any of the nominal genera concerned and the genus bearing that name retaining as its type species the nominal species previously designated, indicated or selected as such.

Article 30, Rule (g), and "Opinion" 6 (special method of selecting the type species of a genus established before 1931 with only two included species)

36. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (g) in Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 6 (which lays it down that the type species of a genus established without a designated or indicated type species and containing two, but not more than two, originally included nominal species is automatically determined when one of the nominal species becomes the type species of a monotypical genus), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 36 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, a genus established without a designated or indicated type species contains two, but not more than two, originally included nominal species and later the same or another author designates or indicates one of those nominal species as the type species of a new monotypical genus, that action automatically constitutes the selection of the remaining species as the type species of the original genus.

Article 30, Rule (g), and "Opinion" 14 (selection of a nominal species to be the type species of a genus not invalidated where

37. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (g) in Article 30 given in *Opinion* 14 (which lays it down that, where an author, in selecting a nominal species to be the type species of a genus established without a designated or indicated type species, himself

the author making the selection himself misidentifies the species which he so selects)

misidentifies the species which he so selects, that error does not invalidate the selection of the type species so made) and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 37 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, a genus was established without a designated or indicated type species and at any time after the date of publication of the generic name in question an author selects one of the originally included nominal species to be the type species but, in doing so, himself misidentifies the species which he so selects, that selection is not invalidated by reason of the error so committed.

Article 30 (all Rules) and "Opinions" 65 and 168 (the original author of a generic name to be assumed to have identified correctly the nominal species referred by him to the genus so named)

38. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 30 given in *Opinions* 65 and 168 (which lay down the proposition that an author who publishes a generic name is in the first instance to be assumed to have identified correctly the species referred by him to the genus so named) and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 38 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that an author who publishes a name for a genus is, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, to be assumed to have identified correctly the nominal species referred by him to the genus so named and therefore that, where either the original author himself designates or indicates, or the same or some other author later selects, one of the originally included nominal species to be the type species of the genus, the designation, indication or, as the case may be, the selection so made, is not to be rejected on the ground that the original author of the generic name misidentified some other nominal species with that nominal species, but

(2) that, where there were grounds for considering that such a species had been misidentified by the original author of the genus, the case was to be submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature which, if satisfied that the species in question had been so misidentified, was, under its plenary powers, to designate as the type species of the genus concerned, either (a)

PURCHASED
2[illegible] MAY 1950

THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, have great pleasure in expressing their grateful thanks to the UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION (U.N.E.S.C.O.) for the financial assistance afforded towards the cost of producing the present volume.

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Notice to subscribers regarding the arrangements made for the completion of volume 1 and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5

The following arrangements have been made for completing volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5 :—

Volume 1 : A concluding Part (Part 12), containing, *inter alia*, the Title Page, Table of Contents, and alphabetical subject index, will be published shortly.

Volume 2 : This volume, like Volume 1, will be devoted to the publication of applications in regard to nomenclatorial problems submitted by specialists to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. Publication will commence at an early date.

Volume 3 : This volume, which is now complete in 9 Parts, is devoted to the publication of the memoranda, reports and other documents considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at their meetings held in Paris in July 1948.

Volume 4 : This volume will be devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July* 1948. Parts 1-9 have already been published and the remaining Parts are in the press.

Volume 5 : At the request of the Bureau of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, this volume will be devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July* 1948, together with the Reports submitted to the Congress by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature.

INQUIRIES

All inquiries regarding publications should be addressed to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, and all inquiries regarding the scientific work of the Commission to the Secretary to the Commission at the following addresses :—

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7, England.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : Secretariat of the Commission, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.

Printed in Great Britain by Metchim and Son, Ltd., Westminster, London

VOLUME 4. Parts 7/9
pp. 159—254.

25th May, 1950

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

PURCHASED
26 MAY 1950

BRITISH MUSEUM NATURAL HISTORY

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

CONTENTS :

The Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July 1948 : Page

Conclusions of Sixth Meeting (*concluding portion*) - - - - - 159-189
Conclusions of Seventh Meeting - - - 190-229
Conclusions of Eighth Meeting - - - 230-238
Conclusions of Ninth Meeting (*first instalment*) - - - - - 239-254

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth
International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948,
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the
International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
at the Publications Office of the Trust
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1950

Price One pound, eight shillings.

(*All rights reserved*)

the species intended by the original author when citing the name of the erroneously determined species, or (b), if the identity of that species is doubtful, a species in harmony with current nomenclatorial usage, save that where the said Commission was of the opinion that greater confusion than uniformity would result from so doing, it was to direct that the designation or indication, or, as the case might be, the selection as the type species of the genus concerned of the nominal species cited by the original author of the genus was to be accepted.

Article 30 and " Opinion " 46 (selection of a type species for a genus to which no nominal species was distinctly referred by the original author)

39. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 46 (which lays down what species are eligible for selection as the type species of a genus, the generic name of which is published with a definition or description but with no nominal species distinctly referred to it), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 39 of the list submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

It was pointed out in discussion that of all the *Opinions* rendered by the Commission *Opinion* 46, more than any other, had given rise to confusion and difficulty. There were two reasons for this, first the mutually contradictory decisions recorded in the " summary ", second, the discrepancy between the " summary " and certain observations recorded in the section of the *Opinion* headed " Discussion." The first of these difficulties arose from the fact that the " summary " stated that no species was eligible for selection as the type species of a genus established without clearly specified included species unless it could be " recognised from the original generic publication " and that where it was not clear how many or what species were involved, the genus was to be deemed to include " all the species of the world which would come under the generic description as originally published ", while in the remaining portion of the same sentence it was stated that " the first species published in connection with the genus (as *Aclastus rufipes* Ashmead, 1902) becomes *ipso facto* the type ". No word was said as to what the position would be if the first species so published disagreed with the generic description as originally published. This ambiguity had led to much argument, and much diversity of practice, some workers assuming that the first decision took precedence over the second, others taking the opposite point of view. The second difficulty arose from the fact that the " Discussion " in *Opinion* 46 laid down a long series of criteria for determining the method to be adopted in " recognising " the species included in a genus belonging to the present class, criteria which (as experience had shown) were totally unworkable. These criteria had fortunately not been included in the " summary " of *Opinion* 46 and therefore did not form part of the substantive decision embodied in that *Opinion*. Nevertheless, the publication of these criteria in that *Opinion* in a manner which suggested that they formed part of the Commission's decision had been most misleading, and this also had given rise to much misunderstanding and unnecessary confusion.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 5th Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

In further discussion it was agreed that the section of *Opinion* 46 requiring that a species to be eligible for selection as a type species must be " recognised from " or " come under " the original generic description was not only in contradiction with the later provision (that " the first species published in connection with the genus becomes *ipso facto* the type ") but also offended against the principle (referred to in the discussion on Article 35 at the Meeting noted in the margin) that the *Règles* should be based as far as possible on objective nomenclatorial facts and that their application should be independent of the subjective taxonomic views of individual workers. The first of the provisions in *Opinion* 46 had been found unworkable in practice. By far the best course therefore would be to delete the first part of the decision in *Opinion* 46, which, through the subjective character of the rule so laid down, was incapable of securing stability in the nomenclature of the genera concerned. Once this had been done, the remaining portion of the decision in *Opinion* 46, namely that the first species to be cited in connection with a genus originally established without any clearly specified included species was to be accepted as the type species would constitute a rule that was clear, objective and easy to operate.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(*For a later decision expanding the scope of this decision, see Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 30)

(1) to recommend that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January 1931, a generic name was published for a genus established (a) with an indication, definition or description (b) with no nominal species distinctly referred to it, the first nominal species to be subsequently so referred to it by the same or another author is to be deemed to have been an originally included species and that species automatically becomes the type species of the genus in question ;

(2) to cancel the decisions embodied in *Opinion* 46, other than the decision proposed in (1) above to be incorporated in the *Règles*.

Article 30 and " Opinion " 172 (selection of the type species of a genus in a literature-recording serial)

40. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 39 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 172 (which relates to the selection of the type species of a genus in a literature-recording serial), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 40 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, a name was published for a genus for which no species was designated or indicated as the type species and the first occasion on which one of the originally included species was so selected or specified was in a literature-recording serial, that type selection is to be accepted.

Article 34 and " Opinion " 147 (application to generic names of provisions in the third paragraph of Article 35)

41. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 34 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 147 (which applied to generic names the provisions relating to specific trivial names prescribed in the third paragraph of Article 35), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 41 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 7)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reminded the Commission that earlier during the present meeting they had agreed to recommend that the expression " of the same origin and meaning " should be deleted from paragraph (3) of Article 35 and had taken note that the adoption of this recommendation by the Congress would require that a consequential amendment should be made in *Opinion* 147 by which the provisions in regard to specific trivial names contained in that paragraph had been applied to generic names. The Commission had not, however, amended that *Opinion*, in view of the proposals submitted in Commission Papers I.C.(48)10 and 11 in favour of the codification of decisions in existing *Opinions*, as it had been thought that the most convenient method of attaining the desired end would be to await the consideration of the recommendation to be submitted to the Congress for the codification of *Opinion* 147.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that, where it is evident that two generic names either (1) consist of the same Latin word or of the same Latinised word (including proper names other than modern patronymics), or (2) are based upon the same modern patronymic, or (3) are based upon the name of the same continent, country, district, town or other place or upon the name of the same geographical feature such as a mountain, island, sea, river or lake, and the said generic names are distinguished from one another only by one or more of the undermentioned differences in spelling, the two names are to be treated as homonyms of one another.

(*Later Reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 4)

(a) the use of "ae," "oe," and "e";
(b) the use of "ei," "i," and "y";
(c) the use of "c" and "k";
(d) the aspiration or non-aspiration of a consonant;
(e) the presence or absence of a "c" before a "t";
(f) the use of a single or double consonant.

Article 34 and "Opinion" 25 (clarification of provisions determining whether one generic name is identical with another)

42. In the course of the discussion recorded in the preceding Conclusion, the attention of the Commission was drawn to the interpretation of Article 34 given in *Opinion* 25, in which it had been ruled, in the case of the generic names *Damesiella* Tornquist, 1899, and *Damesella* Walcott, 1905, that a generic name was not to be rejected as a homonym of a previously published generic name if it differed therefrom solely by the presence of the letter "i" before the termination "-ella." The view was expressed that it was neither necessary nor desirable expressly to include in the *Règles* the interpretation of Article 34 given in *Opinion* 25. In a case of this kind the only satisfactory course was for the *Règles* to give a complete list of those cases where differences in spelling were to be regarded as being so small as to render a generic name spelt in one way a homonym of a generic name spelt in the other way and, having done this, clearly to lay it down that any generic name which was distinguished from every other generic name by any other difference in spelling was to be regarded as a distinct name and therefore not to be rejected as a homonym. The first part of this two-fold need had already been met in the *Règles*, for trivial names by Article 35 and for generic names by the decision in *Opinion* 147, by which those provisions had been applied to generic names.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

> that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that the provision relating to the differences in spelling which were to be ignored in determining whether a given generic name was a homonym of another generic name specified in Article 34 as amended in accordance with Conclusion 41 above was an exhaustive provision and therefore that no generic name which differed from another generic name in any other way was to be rejected as a homonym of that generic name.

Article 35 (need for definition of conditions in which one trivial name is to be regarded as identical with another)

43. Arising out of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 42 above, it was pointed out that the provisions in Article 35, prescribing the conditions in which one trivial name is to be regarded as a homonym of another trivial name, required clarification on the same lines as those proposed for generic names in Conclusion 42 above. It was suggested also that, although it should be evident from Article 14 (which requires, *inter alia*, that, where a trivial name is an adjective, it is to agree in gender with the name of the genus to which the species in question is referred) that differences in termination due to differences of gender should be ignored in considering whether any given adjectival trivial name is a homonym of another such trivial name, it would be helpful to some zoologists expressly to lay this down in Article 35.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear :—

(a) that, in determining whether two trivial names, each consisting of an adjective, are homonyms of one another, no account is to be taken of the gender in which either is expressed and accordingly differences in termination due solely to such differences in gender are to be ignored ;

(b) that, subject to the insertion in Article 35 of the addition specified in (a) above and of paragraph (e) of the third paragraph of Article 35 in its existing form, the provisions relating to generic names specified in Conclusion 42 above should apply also to trivial names.

Article 34 and " Opinions " 125 and 148 (status of emendations in relation to generic homonymy)

44. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 34 of the *Règles* given in paragraph (2) of *Opinion* 125 in an individual case and in general terms in *Opinion* 148 (which relates to the status of a generic name which is identical with a previously published emendation of an earlier generic name), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 42 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that a generic name is to be rejected as a homonym, where the word of which that name consists has previously been published as an emendation, whether valid or invalid, of another generic name.

Article 34 and " Opinion " 148 paragraph (3) : interpretation in, not to be incorporated in the " Règles " and to be cancelled

45. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 34 of the *Règles* given in paragraph (3) of *Opinion* 148 (which laid it down that a generic name published as a substitute for a generic name which is an invalid homonym is not to be rejected on the ground that it is of the same origin and meaning as the name which it replaces), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 43 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, having regard to the decision recorded in Conclusion 41 above on the subject of the codification of *Opinion* 147, the provisions of paragraph (3) of *Opinion* 148 were no longer appropriate and should not be incorporated in the *Règles*.

(2) to cancel paragraph (3) of *Opinion* 148.

Articles 34 and 35 and " Opinion" 102 (status of a generic or trivial name when a homonym of the name of a unit of sub-ordinal or higher category)

46. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 34 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 102 (which laid it down that the availability of a generic name is not affected by the prior publication of the same or a similar word as the name for a unit of a higher category), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 44 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

It was pointed out that the wording in the " summary " was unsatisfactory, (a) because, in view of the combined provisions of Articles 4 and 8, the problem discussed in that *Opinion* could not arise in connection with a family name and was therefore confined to cases where the name given to a new genus had already been given to a unit of sub-ordinal or higher rank, and (b) because homonymy could only arise if the name published for the new genus was the same name as that previously used for a unit of sub-ordinal or higher category. The reference in the " summary " to a situation in which the names used were similar but not identical was therefore entirely misconceived. It was necessary that these defects should be eliminated before proposals were submitted for the codification of the decision embodied in this *Opinion*.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that the Law of Homonymy does not apply as between generic or trivial names on the one hand and the names of units belonging to categories above the family level on the other, and therefore that, where such a name consists of a word which has already been used as the name of a unit of Sub-Ordinal or higher category, that name is not to be rejected as an invalid homonym (Example : The Ordinal name Siphonophora Eschscholtz, 1829, does not invalidate the generic name *Siphonophora* Koch, 1855) ;

(2) that a *Recommandation* should be inserted at an appropriate point in the *Règles* deprecating the selection as generic or trivial names of words

previously published as the names of units of Sub-Ordinal or higher category.

Articles 25, 34 and 35 and " Opinion " 145 (subsequent status of a name first published in a work rejected for nomenclatorial purposes)

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting Conclusion* 35)

47. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Articles 34 and 35 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 145 (in relation to the status of generic and specific names, when those names have been previously published in works rejected for nomenclatorial purposes), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 45 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where a work is rejected for nomenclatorial purposes either under Article 25 or under a decision taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature under their plenary powers, no name, whether a generic name or a trivial name, which first appeared in such a work, is to be treated as having any status either in respect of the Law of Priority (Article 25) or in respect of the Law of Homonymy (Articles 34–36) as from the date of its appearance in a work so rejected, and that in consequence no later name is to be rejected as a synonym on the ground that some other name had been applied to the genus or species concerned in a work so rejected and no later name is to be rejected as a homonym on the ground that it had previously been used in such a work.

Article 25 (meaning of expression " divulgué dans une publication ") : postponement of consideration of interpretations of, in " Opinions " 15 and 51

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 15)

48. THE COMMISSION agreed :—
to defer consideration of the interpretations of the expression " divulgué dans une publication " as used in Article 25 of the *Règles*, given in *Opinions* 15 and 51, until they came to consider the general proposals for the clarification of the foregoing expression submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14 (Point (26)).

Repeal for interpretative purposes of certain " Opinions " rendered by the Commission

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 9(1)(*b*))

49. On concluding the survey, recorded in Conclusions 11 to 47 above, of the interpretations of Articles of the *Règles* given in the *Opinions* listed in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11, THE COMMISSION recalled the decision in regard to the status to be accorded to interpretative *Opinions* after the interpretations given therein had been incorporated in the *Règles*, in whole or in part, which they had taken when earlier during the present meeting they had considered Commission Paper I.C.(48)10 and agreed :—

to repeal for interpretative purposes, that is to say for all except historical purposes, with effect from the date on which the amendments to the *Règles* made by the present Congress become operative :—

(a) the whole of the undermentioned *Opinions*, namely :—

Opinions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 35, 46, 62, 64, 65, 87, 141, 145, 147, 148, 164, 168, 172, 183, 191 ;

(b) the portions of the undermentioned *Opinions* which contain interpretations of Articles of the *Règles*, namely :—

Opinions 14, 16, 18, 25, 26, 27, 29, 36, 41, 43, 47, 49, 52, 59, 60, 61, 63, 88, 102, 125.

Resolutions on questions relating to nomenclature embodied in " Declarations " rendered by the Commission : proposed codification of

50. THE COMMISSION had before them a memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission containing detailed proposals for the incorporation in the *Règles* of the resolutions on various aspects of zoological nomenclature embodied in the *Declarations* rendered by the Commission at various dates (Commission Paper I.C.(48)13).

THE COMMISSION :—

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 4(2)(*f*))

(1) recalled that, since Commission Paper I.C.(48)13 had been prepared, they had agreed in principle at the meeting noted in the margin to recommend the incorporation in the *Règles* of provisions embodying the resolutions recorded in certain of the *Declarations* rendered by the Commission at various times ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion* 7(2))

(2) recalled that at the meeting noted in the margin they had already agreed to recommend that the Plenary Powers Resolution of March, 1913 (which formed the subject of *Declaration* 5), as amended at that meeting, should be incorporated in the *Règles;*

(3) agreed that the questions dealt with in *Declarations* 9 and 10, being of the nature of statements of policy, were not of a kind which could appropriately be incorporated in the *Règles;*

(4) agreed to examine *Declarations* 1–4, 6–8, 11 and 12, and the recommendations in regard thereto submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)13, with a view to reaching conclusions in regard to the incorporation in the *Règles* of the provisions included in those *Declarations*.

" Declarations " 1 and 12 (Code of Ethics)

51. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the Resolutions relating to the Code of Ethics embodied in *Declarations* 1 and 12, together with the proposal in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 6 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)13.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that there should be inserted in the *Règles* an Article laying it down that, when a worker notices that a generic or subgeneric name or a name of a species, subspecies or infra-subspecific form published as a new name by an author who is alive at the time of the foregoing discovery is invalid by reason of being a homonym and requires to be replaced, the author making such a discovery should notify the author by whom the name in question was published and, before himself publishing a substitute name, should, so far as practicable, give the original author an opportunity of so doing, it being made clear that the observance of the foregoing provision is a matter to be left to the proper feelings of individual workers, it not being part of the duties of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to investigate or pass judgment upon alleged contraventions of this provision.

" Declaration " 4 (avoidance of intemperate language in the discussion of zoological nomenclature)

52. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the Resolution deprecating the use of intemperate language in the discussion of zoological nomenclature embodied in *Declaration* 4, together with the proposal in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 7 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)13.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that there should be inserted in the *Règles* an Article laying it down that the use of intemperate language is to be avoided in the discussion of zoological nomenclature.

" Declaration " 2 (avoidance of issue of separates in advance of publication of the paper concerned)

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 19)

53. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the Resolution deprecating the distribution of separates of a paper prior to the publication of that paper embodied in *Declaration* 2, together with the proposal in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 8 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)13.

In submitting the foregoing matter to the Commission, the ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that it had already been decided to recommend to the Congress that words should be inserted in the *Règles* embodying the interpretation of Article 25 given in *Opinion* 59, in which the Commission had laid it down that a new name which appeared in the separate of a paper distributed prior to the publication of that paper in the book or serial for publication in which it had been printed ranked for purposes of priority not from the date of the distribution of the separates but from the later date on which the paper in question was actually published in the serial in question. The Resolution embodied in *Declaration* 2 had been adopted by the Commission simultaneously with *Opinion* 59, of which it was intended to be a supplement ; it urged authors to avoid the practice of distributing separates in advance of the publication of the book or serial containing the paper reproduced in such separates. *Declaration* 2 could therefore appropriately be embodied in the *Règles* as a *Recommandation* to the portion of Article 25 in which the provisions of *Opinion* 59 were to be embodied.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that there should be added to the portion of Article 25 in which the decision given in *Opinion* 59 was to be embodied a *Recommandation* urging editors not to make available, and authors not to distribute, copies of papers prior to those papers being actually published in the book or serial for inclusion in which they had been printed.

" Declaration " 6 (need for clearly indicating as new every name when first published)

54. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the portion of the Resolution embodied in *Declaration* 6 which urged every author who publishes a new name clearly to indicate that he is so doing, together with the proposal in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 9 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)13.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 5th Meeting, Conclusion* 1(8)(*a*) *and* (*b*))

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reminded the Commission that, since the foregoing proposal had been submitted, they had agreed, at the meeting noted in the margin, at which they had considered the plan for regulating the nomenclature of subspecies and infra-subspecific forms, to recommend the insertion in the *Règles* of a *Recommandation*, urging every author, when publishing a new subspecific name, to add the expression " ssp.n." or some equivalent expression immediately after the subspecific trivial name and, when publishing a name for a new infra-subspecific form, the expression " form. n." or some equivalent expression. For these two categories of name, the Commission had therefore already agreed to recommend the insertion in the *Règles* of a *Recommandation* which would give effect to the Resolution embodied in *Declaration* 6. In order fully to give effect to the Resolution embodied in that *Declaration*, it was necessary now to deal in a similar way with names at the species level and above covered by the *Règles*, that was to say, with names of Families to names of species (both inclusive).

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that there should be added at some appropriate point in the *Règles* a *Recommandation* urging every author, when publishing a new Family or Sub-Family name clearly, to indicate that that name is a new name by inserting immediately after that name a comma followed by the expression "fam.n." or "sub-fam.n.", as the case may be, or some equivalent expression ;

(2) that there should be added to the *Règles* a *Recommandation* urging every author, when publishing a new generic or subgeneric name or a new specific name, clearly to indicate that that name is a new name by inserting immediately after that name a comma followed by the expression "gen.n.", "subgen.n.", "sp.n.", as the case may be, or some equivalent expression.

"Declaration" 6 (need for avoiding the publication of a name as new on more than one occasion)

55. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the portion of the Resolution embodied in *Declaration* 6, which urged authors not to publish names as new names on more than one occasion, together with the proposal in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 9 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)13.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should be added at some appropriate point in the *Règles* a *Recommandation* or *Recommandations* urging every author, when publishing a new name belonging to a category recognised in the *Règles*, i.e. a new name for any category from Family to infra-subspecific form (both inclusive), (a) not to publish that name as a new name in more than one book or paper and (b) not to publish in more than one serial a paper containing a new name, without indicating on the second, or any subsequent, occasion that the paper in question had already been published and giving a bibliographical reference to the serial in which that paper had been first published.

"Declarations" 3 and 8 (need for giving a clear indication of date of publication)

56. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the Resolutions embodied in *Declarations* 3 and 8 regarding the need for giving in every zoological book or other publication a clear indication of its date of publication, together with the proposal in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 10 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)13.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should be added at some appropriate point in the *Règles* a *Recommandation* urging every editor or other person concerned with the publication of a book or serial concerned with zoology to take all necessary steps to ensure :—

(a) that its exact date of publication (year, month, day) be clearly stated in every zoological work ;

(b) that, in the case of serials and separate works published in parts, each part shall bear its exact date of publication and that on the completion of the volume concerned there shall be added a statement giving the date on which each part was published and specifying its exact contents (both pages and plates).

" Declaration " 7 (need for citation of bibliographical references)

57. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the Resolution on the need for the citation of bibliographical references embodied in *Declaration* 7, together with the proposal in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 11 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)13.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should be added at some appropriate point in the *Règles* a provision urging every author who cites a generic, subgeneric, specific, subspecific, or infra-subspecific name to insert at least once in the paper concerned the name of the author, and the date of publication, of each name cited or preferably to give a full bibliographical reference to the original place of publication of every such name.

" Declaration " 11 (need for indicating the systematic position of new taxonomic units)

58. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the Resolution on the need for indicating in original descriptions the systematic position in the Animal Kingdom of the taxonomic unit described, embodied in *Declaration* 11, together with the proposal in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 12 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)13.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should be added at some appropriate point in the *Règles* a *Recommandation* urging every author, when naming a new taxonomic unit from Family to infra-subspecific form, clearly to indicate the systematic position of that unit in the Animal Kingdom, and, in the case of categories from genus to infra-subspecific form (both inclusive), to indicate the Class and Order to which the unit in question is referable and, if the Order concerned is commonly divided into Families, the name of the Family to which the unit in question is referable.

Repeal except for historical purposes of " Declarations " so far rendered by the Commission

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 9(2)(e)*)

59. On concluding the survey, recorded in Conclusions 51 to 58 above, of the Resolutions embodied in the *Declarations*, regarding which proposals were submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)13, THE COMMISSION recalled the decision in regard to the status to be accorded to *Declarations* after the Resolutions set forth therein had been incorporated in the *Règles*, which they had taken when earlier during the present meeting they had considered Commission Paper I.C.(48)10.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

> to repeal except for historical purposes the *Declarations* so far rendered by the Commission, namely *Declarations* 1-12, with effect from the date on which the amendments to the *Règles* made by the present Congress become operative.

Miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the "Règles" : first instalment to be considered item by item

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 4*)

60. THE COMMISSION had before them a memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission containing a list of twenty miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles* (Commission Paper I.C.(48)12).

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) recalled that, since Commission Paper I.C.(48)12 had been prepared, they had agreed in principle at the meeting noted in the margin to recommend the adoption of such amendments to the *Règles* as might be necessary for the clarification of existing provisions, for providing for matters not already dealt with, and for removing blemishes due to careless or inexpert drafting ;

(2) agreed to examine Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, point by point, for the purpose of reaching conclusions regarding the recommendations to be submitted in regard to the questions raised therein.

Article 8 (need for brevity in generic names), insertion of "Recommandation" regarding

61. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (Z.N.(S.)297) for the insertion of a provision in Article 8 of the *Règles* designed to encourage authors to select short words for new generic names, together with the proposal in regard thereto submitted in Point (1) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12. This proposal had been originally submitted by Professor J. C. Faure (University of Pretoria, Union of South Africa) on behalf of himself and others. More recently a similar proposal of somewhat wider scope had been received from Professor Pierre Bonnet (University of Toulouse, France).

In the discussion on this proposal general agreement was expressed regarding the desirability of the insertion in Article 8 of a *Recommandation* (as proposed by Professor Faure) urging authors to select short words when proposing names for new genera and subgenera. It was felt, however, that there were objections to indicating (as was proposed) a specified number of letters as the maximum to be used for any generic or subgeneric name. The general view was that the desired object could best be promoted by a *Recommandation* urging that such names should be short. It was agreed also to add to the *Recommandation* that such words should be euphonious. Admittedly, there were words which were euphonious in some languages but not in others, but in judging whether for the present purpose a given name was or was not euphonious, it must be borne in mind that, as the language of zoological nomenclature was the Latin language, it was from this standpoint that the question must be viewed.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that there should be added either to Article 8 or to Article 25, whichever was found to be the most convenient, a *Recommandation*, urging every author, when naming a new genus or subgenus or renaming a genus or subgenus the name of which is invalid by reason of being a homonym, to select a name which was short and, from the standpoint of the Latin language, euphonious.

Article 13 (deletion of provisions permitting the use of a capital initial letter for a specific trivial name in certain cases)

62. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (2) of Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, that the provision in Article 13 under which an author was given the option to write certain classes of specific (and subspecific) trivial names with a capital initial letter should be deleted from the *Règles*. This proposal had been submitted independently also by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) in the fourth of the propositions which he had laid before the Commission.

This proposal was warmly welcomed, the view of those present being that the use of a capital initial letter for a specific trivial name was objectionable, as being liable to cause confusion between specific trivial names so written and generic names. This provision had been inserted in Article 13 in Berlin in 1901 because at that time there were many zoologists who habitually used capital initial letters for certain classes of specific trivial name and who were unwilling to abandon that practice. In the 50 years which had since elapsed the number of such zoologists had greatly diminished and was now extremely small. The time had therefore come when this obsolete provision should be repealed.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that Article 13 should be redrafted so as to require that every specific trivial name should be written with a small initial letter.

Article 14 (need for brevity in specific and subspecific trivial names), insertion of a "Recommandation" regarding

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 61)

63. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (3) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12 that, consequential upon the adoption of the proposal submitted in Point (1) of that Paper that a *Recommandation* should be added to Article 8 urging the desirability of selecting short words as the names of new genera and subgenera, a corresponding *Recommandation* should be added to Article 14, in regard to the selection of new specific and subspecific trivial names.

The view was expressed that in this matter the provisions in the *Règles* in regard to specific and subspecific trivial names should correspond with those for generic and subgeneric names. It would be necessary therefore to amend the proposal submitted in the present case in the same way as it had just been agreed to amend the corresponding proposal in regard to generic and subgeneric names.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should either be added to Article 14 a *Recommandation*, urging every author, when naming a new species or subspecies or renaming a species or subspecies the name of which was invalid by reason of being a homonym, to select a name which is short and, from the standpoint of the Latin language, euphonious, or, if it were found more convenient to attach to Article 25 the *Recommandation* regarding the foregoing problem in relation to the names of genera and subgenera, which, as agreed in Conclusion 61 above, it was proposed should be added either to Article 8 or to Article 25, to include in that *Recommandation* a reference to the trivial names of species, subspecies and infra-subspecific forms.

Examples cited in the "Règles" to be drawn only from works by binominal authors

64. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a note (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (4) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, in which attention was drawn to the fact that, as Goeze was not a consistently binominal author, it was not suitable that that author's usage of a previously published specific name should be cited as an example in Article 24. It was accordingly proposed that this example should be deleted from that Article and that another example based upon the action of a strictly binominal author should be inserted in its place.

It was pointed out in the discussion that Article 24 was not the only place in the *Règles* where a usage by Goeze was cited as an example, and the view was expressed that it was desirable that the proposal submitted should be extended so as to cover all examples at present included in the *Règles* which were drawn from the usage of non-binominal authors.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that " examples " cited in the *Règles* to illustrate particular provisions should be drawn only from the works of strictly binominal authors and that, wherever at present an " example " was drawn from a work by an author who was not strictly binominal, that example should be replaced by one which conformed to the requirement specified above.

Article 22 (abbreviation of authors' names): substitution of a revised "Recommandation"

65. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (5) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12 that the *Recommandation* which at present appeared in Article 22 of the *Règles* should be deleted and that there should be inserted in its place a new *Recommandation* urging authors, when citing scientific names, not to abbreviate the names of the authors of such names, except in the case of very well-known deceased authors. As regards the first of these proposals, it was pointed out that in the course of the last 50 years the existing *Recommandation* contained in Article 22 had become obsolete and unworkable, as the book which that *Recommandation* advised authors to consult had long been out of print and was virtually unobtainable. A proposal in the same sense as the above had been received from Professor Pierre Bonnet (France).

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that the existing *Recommandation* should be deleted from Article 22 and that there should be inserted in its place a *Recommandation* urging authors, when citing previously published names or previously published papers, to refrain from abbreviating the name of the author of the name or paper concerned, except, if it was so desired, the names of deceased authors whose names, even if abbreviated, would be easily recognised, by reason of the importance of their published work.

Articles 25, 34 and 35 (status of apparent new names or new combinations due to errors in literature-recording serials defined) .

66. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by Dr. Curtis W. Sabrosky (Washington) (file Z.N.(S.)334), in regard to the status of apparent new names (generic or trivial) and new combinations, where these are due to errors in abstracting or literature-recording serials, together with a proposal in regard thereto submitted in Point (6) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be added to Article 25 to make it clear that, when reference to an original publication shows that an apparent new name (whether generic or trivial) or an apparent new combination appearing in a literature-recording serial is due to an error in that serial, the apparent new name or new combination shall have no status in nomenclature and is not to be held to pre-occupy for the purposes of Article 34 or Article 35 the same name or the same combination when later published deliberately for the same or another genus or species, as the case may be.

Article 25, Proviso (b) (meaning of the expression " principes de la nomenclature binominale ")

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

67. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (7) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, in regard to the meaning of the expression " principes de la nomenclature binominale ", which it had been agreed, at the meeting noted in the margin, should be substituted for the expression " principes de la nomenclature binaire ", which at present appeared in Proviso (b) to Article 25 of the *Règles*.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted in Article 25 to make it clear that, in order to qualify, for the purposes of Proviso (b) to Article 25, as an author who had applied " les principes de la nomenclature binominale ", an author must have consistently applied those principles in the book or paper in question and not merely in a particular section or passage thereof.

Article 30 (clarification of applicability to generic names published after 31st December, 1930)

68. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (8) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, that the position should be clarified as regards the applicability of Article 30 of the *Règles* to generic names published after 31st December 1930, that is to say, to generic names published subsequent to the entry into force of the provisions of Proviso (c) to Article 25 adopted by the Budapest Congress in 1927.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the wording of Article 30 had been defective ever since the beginning of 1931, for, although, as it stood, the wording implied that the Article applied to every generic name, irrespective of its date of publication, Rules (b) and later Rules had as from 1st, January 1931, been restricted, in their application, to names published on or before 31st December, 1930, owing to the coming into force on 1st January, 1931 of the amendment to Article 25 adopted by the Congress at its Budapest meeting in 1927. It was desirable that, as part of the general clean-up of the *Règles*, words should now be inserted in Article 30 to make the position clear. As regards Rules (a) to (d) in Article 30 the Commission had agreed (at the meeting noted in the margin) to recommend that words should be inserted in Article 30 to make it clear that in their present form these Rules applied to names published on or after 1st January, 1931 as well as to names published before that date. Earlier in the present meeting, the Commission, when considering the action to be taken for the incorporation in the *Règles* of interpretations given by the Commission in *Opinions* rendered before the opening of the present Congress, had had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (a) given in *Opinion* 7 and the interpretations of Rule (d) given in *Opinions* 18 and 16, and had agreed to recommend that words should be inserted in Article 30 to give effect to those interpretations, so far as regards generic names published on or before 31st December, 1930, but that it should be made clear at the same time that these interpretations of Rules (a) and (d) in Article 30, which, in effect, represented relaxations of those Rules, should not apply to generic names published on or after 1st January, 1931, the date as from which newly published generic names became subject to the more rigorous provisions of Proviso (c) to Article 25.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 8)

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusions* 27, 29, 30)

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that words should be inserted in Article 30 to make it clear :—

(a) that in their present form (i.e. in their pre-Paris Congress form) Rules (a), (b), (c) (as relaxed by *Opinion* 47) and (d) apply to every generic name, irrespective of its date of publication ;

(b) that the wording which, in accordance with the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin, it was now proposed should be employed to enlarge the scope (i) of Rule (a) to give effect to the interpretation thereof

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusions* 27, 29, 30) given in *Opinion* 7, and (ii) of Rule (d) to give effect to the interpretations of that Rule given in *Opinions* 16 and 18 should be such as to make it clear that those interpretations applied only to generic names published prior to 1st January, 1931;

(c) that Rule (e) and subsequent Rules apply only to names published prior to 1st January 1931;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 8)

(2) that the words to be inserted in Article 25 to give effect to the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin should be so selected as to make it clear that no generic or subgeneric name published after 31st December, 1930 is to be treated as having been published with a designated or indicated type species, unless such a species is so designated or indicated in accordance with one or other of the Rules in Article 30 lettered (a) to (d), as those Rules existed at the opening of the present Congress, that is to say without the extensions to Rules (a) and (d) specified in (1)(b) above.

Article 30 (drafting amendments required to remove ambiguities)

69. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (9) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, that there should be inserted in Article 30 such drafting amendments as might be necessary to make it clear that the provisions of that Article were concerned with nomenclature and not with taxonomy. It was pointed out that what was required was that the wording should be modified so as to make it clear that the purpose of this Article was to provide rules by which, for any given nominal genus (i.e. the concept denoted by a given generic name) one of the originally included nominal species (i.e. the concept denoted by one of the specific names cited) is to be designated, indicated or selected as the type species of the nominal genus in question. One of the modifications required was the substitution in this Article of the expressions " nominal genus " and " nominal species " for the expressions " genus " and " species " at present used. The introduction of these expressions would eliminate from this Article such expressions as " publication of a genus ", which involved a serious confusion of thought.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reminded the Commission that, when, at the meeting noted in the margin, they had drawn up recommendations for clarifying Article 31, they had found it necessary to introduce the expression " nominal species " for in no other way was it possible in that Article to distinguish, in the case of a composite species, between the nomenclatorial concept of a " nominal species " and the concept of the various taxonomic species of which the single " nominal species " was composed. The object of the proposal to substitute the expression " nominal species" for the expression " species " in Article 31 was to make it clear that it was the first and not the second of these concepts with which that Article was concerned. It was for similar reasons that it was proposed to substitute in Article 30 the expression " nominal genus " for the expression " genus ", wherever that expression was at present employed. Finally, it was necessary to introduce words into this Article to make it clear, as regards any given " nominal genus " which were the " nominal species " which were to be regarded as having been included in the genus by the original author when he published the generic name and therefore which were the " nominal species " from among which a later author was entitled to select the type species of the " nominal genus " concerned in those cases where the type species was not designated or indicated at the time when the generic name was first published.

In the discussion which ensued, there was general agreement that, like Article 31, Article 30 was in need of clarification in order to eliminate ambiguities and to secure that the wording employed was directed solely to the problem of nomenclature involved in determining the type species of any " genus " represented by a given generic name (i.e. any " nominal genus "). The question of the nominal species to be regarded as having been originally included in any given " nominal genus " and thus eligible for selection as the type species of that nominal genus was one of some difficulty. If it had been practicable, the most satisfactory course would have been to restrict the field of selection for the type species of a given nominal genus to those nominal species which had been accepted by the original author as taxonomically valid species and had been included by him in the genus. In a large number of cases however the currently adopted type selection of a nominal genus was one in which some author had selected as the type species a nominal species which had been included by the original author of the generic name not as a taxonomically valid species but as a synonym of one of the nominal species accepted by him as a taxonomically valid species and included by him as such in the nominal genus concerned. It was undesirable to do anything which would invalidate such type selections, for this would involve considerable disturbance in existing nomenclatorial practice. The words to be inserted in Article 30 should make it clear therefore that the nominal species to be accepted as having been included in a nominal genus at the time when the name of that genus was first published comprised (1) all the nominal species cited by the author of the generic name and accepted by that author as valid taxonomic species and (2) any nominal species cited by that author as a synonym of a nominal species falling in class (1) above. The selection as the type species of a nominal genus of a nominal species not cited by the original author when first publishing the generic name in question could not be accepted, for such a selection ran counter to the provisions of Rule (e) (*a*) of Article 30. It should be made clear however that, where an author selects a non-originally-included nominal species to be the type species of a given nominal genus and at the same time synonymises that nominal species with a nominal species which was in fact an originally included species, he is to be accepted as having selected that originally included nominal species to be the type species of the nominal genus concerned.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that throughout Article 30 the expression " nominal genus " should be substituted for the expression " genus " and the expression " nominal species " for the expression " species ", these expressions being defined as follows :—

Expression	*Definition*
" Nominal genus "	The concept denoted by a given generic name.
" Nominal species "	The concept denoted by a given specific name.

(2) that the wording of the Rules in Article 30 should be modified to such extent as might be necessary to secure the uniform use (a) of the expression " establishment of a nominal genus " in place of such expressions as the " publication of a genus ", (b), of the expression " type species of a nominal genus " in place of such expressions as " type species of a generic name " and (c) of the words " designate " and " designation " and " indicate " and " indication " for the determination of the type species of a nominal genus, in the first instance under Rule (a) and in the second instance under Rules (b), (c) and (d), the words " select " and " selection " to be used only in connection with Rule (g) ;

(3) that words should be inserted at appropriate points in Article 30 to make it clear :—

(a) that the nominal species to be regarded as having been included in a given nominal genus at the time when the name of that genus was first published are (i) the nominal species cited by the original author as valid taxonomic species belonging to that nominal genus and (ii) any nominal species cited on that occasion as synonyms of nominal species falling in (i) above and that for such a nominal genus the foregoing nominal species were alone eligible for selection as the type species ;

(b) that, where a subsequent author selects as the type species of a nominal genus a nominal species which is not an originally included species, as defined in (a) above or accepts the selection of such a nominal species by a previous author and at the same time synonymises that nominal species with a nominal species which is one of the originally included species, he is to be accepted as having selected that originally included nominal species to be the type species of the nominal genus in question.

Substitution in the " Règles " of the expressions " nominal genus " and " nominal species " for the expressions " genus " and " species " in certain cases

70. Arising out of the discussion regarding the phraseology to be used in Article 30 recorded in the preceding Conclusion,

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that throughout the *Règles* the expressions " nominal genus " and " nominal species " should be substituted for the expressions " genus " and " species " respectively, wherever the provision in question referred not to a genus or to a species in the taxonomic sense but to the concept represented by a given generic name or specific name, as the case might be.

Article 30 (need to eliminate the expression " Rule " from non-mandatory provisions)

71. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (10) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, that the expression " Rule " should be reserved in Article 30 for the mandatory provisions (i.e. the provisions at present lettered (a) to (g)) and that the remaining provisions in this Article, which (as there expressly stated) were *Recommandations* should no longer be lettered consecutively with the (mandatory) Rules. The present arrangement of this Article, which was no doubt due to inexpert drafting, was not only illogical but (as the literature showed) was liable to give the erroneous impression that provisions (h) and later provisions, though described as *Recommandations*, nevertheless possessed some mandatory character.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that the expression " Rule " in Article 30 should be restricted to the first seven provisions (i.e. the provisions lettered (a) to (g)) in that Article which alone possess mandatory force ;

(2) that the non-mandatory precepts at present lettered (h) to (t) should be given a serial notation different from that adopted for the mandatory provisions referred to in (1) above and should be grouped in a *Recommandation* which would urge every author, when selecting a nominal species to be the type species of a nominal genus in accordance with the procedure specified in Rule (g), to guide himself in making that selection by the precepts in question, those precepts being applied successively in the order in which they were there specified.

Article 30, Rule (g) (status of a statement as to the type species of a nominal genus made otherwise than as a deliberate selection)

72. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (11) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, that words should be inserted in Rule (g) in Article 30 to make it clear that a definite statement by a subsequent author that a given originally included nominal species is the type species of a given nominal genus is to be accepted as a type selection, irrespective of whether or not the author making that statement considered himself as at that moment selecting a type species for the nominal genus in question.

In the discussion on this proposal the view was expressed that the issue raised was one on which it was important that a definite ruling should be given ; many thousands of currently accepted type selections rested upon action taken before the introduction of the present *Règles* (i.e. before their promulgation in 1905) by authors who accepted what was then known as the " Law of Elimination " and who, after studying the earlier history of a given generic name, had stated that, as the result of the action of such and such an author or authors, a given nominal species was the type species of the nominal genus concerned. Very great confusion would arise if it were now to be ruled that published statements of this kind were not to be accepted as effective type selections under Rule (g) in Article 30.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, for the purposes of Rule (g) in Article 30, an author is to be treated as having selected a given originally included nominal species to be the type species of a given nominal genus not only when he cites such a species, other than a species excluded under Rule (e) in Article 30 and expressly states that he is so selecting that species but also when he does no more than state that a specified such species is the type species of the nominal genus concerned, irrespective, in the latter case, of whether he states or implies, either correctly or otherwise, that that nominal species had been selected by some previous author to be the type species of that nominal genus or that the nominal species in question had become the type species of that genus through the operation of some rule (for example, the so-called "Law of Elimination") not recognised in the *Règles* as a mandatory provision, provided in such a case that the author concerned makes it clear that he himself accepts, for whatever reason, the species in question as the type species of the genus concerned.

Article 31 (proposed redrafting of first sentence of, to promote greater clarity)

73. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (12) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, that the first sentence of Article 31 of the *Règles* should be redrafted, so as to include a direct statement of the provisions intended in place of the present obscure wording by reference to the provisions in Article 30.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) explained that, since the foregoing proposal had been submitted, the question involved had been settled by the Commission, when considering Commission Paper I.C.(48)6. No action was therefore now called for on the present proposal. Article 31 would however require further amendment if the Commission were to adopt the proposals in regard to the terminology of type specimens, submitted in Point (14) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12. It would, he suggested, be more convenient to defer consideration of this matter until the Commission came to consider Point (14).

THE COMMISSION took note of the above statement.

Article 35 (status of emendations in relation to homonymy in the names of species and lower taxonomic categories)

74. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (13) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, that there should be inserted in Article 35 (relating to specific homonymy) a provision parallel to that laid down in connection with generic homonymy in *Opinion* 148. Proposals for the incorporation in Article 34 of the interpretation of that Article in relation to the status of generic names published as emendations of earlier names had already been submitted to the Commission in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11 ; the proposal put forward in the present Paper was that, whatever decision in this matter might be taken as regards Article 34 in relation to generic names, that decision should be extended to cover also Article 35 in relation to the names of species and subspecies.

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 44)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that the Commission had now adopted recommendations based on the proposal in regard to generic names submitted in paragraph 42 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)11. He suggested therefore that the Commission should now agree to adopt a recommendation in regard to specific and subspecific trivial names parallel to that already adopted in the case of generic names. The proposed provision should apply also to the names of infra-subspecific forms.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear :—

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 20)

(a) that a specific trivial name published as an invalid emendation of an earlier specific trivial name (i.e. a specific trivial name published as an emendation in conditions which do not satisfy the requirements of Article 19) is to be rejected as a synonym of the earlier name, where that name is an available name, the type specimen of the nominal species having as its name the invalid emendation being automatically the same specimen as the type specimen of the nominal species bearing the name which has been invalidly emended ;

(b) that, where a specific trivial name is rejected as an invalid homonym and the next oldest name for the species concerned is an invalid emendation of that name and that invalid emendation is sufficiently different in spelling from the original name not to be a homonym thereof under the provisions contained in Article 35, the specific trivial name originally published as an invalid emendation becomes an available name for the species in question and such a name has priority as from the date on which it was first published as an invalid emendation and is to be attributed to the author by whom it was so published ;

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 44)

(c) that a specific trivial name is to be rejected as a homonym (either primary or secondary) where the word of which that name consists has previously been published as an emendation, whether valid or invalid, of the specific trivial name of another species either originally published, or subsequently placed, in the same genus, save where the original name did not comply with the requirements of Article 25 ;

(d) that the foregoing provisions apply also as between the trivial name of a species and the trivial name of a subspecies of a species originally described or subsequently placed in the same genus and as between the trivial names of subspecies of one or more species so described or so placed ;

(e) that the provisions specified in (a) to (c) above apply as between the trivial names of infra-subspecific forms of one or more species originally described, or subsequently placed, in the same genus.

Terminology of type specimens : proposed insertion in the " Règles " of Articles and " Recommandations " regarding

75. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) that a new Article with accompanying *Recommandations* should be inserted in the *Règles* regulating the terminology of type specimens, submitted in Point (14) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12. This proposal included suggestions for the recognition of certain specified categories of type specimens, for the designation and marking of such specimens and the measures to be taken for their safe custody.

In the discussion on this proposal, the following points were made :—

(a) It was very desirable that the inadequate provision in regard to type specimens at present included in the *Appendice* to the *Règles* should be replaced by comprehensive regulations on the lines suggested in the paper submitted to the Commission. As submitted, those proposals related only to animals which were sufficiently large for individual specimens to be mounted separately, and it would be necessary to provide for the case where, by reason of the small size of the animals concerned, two or more specimens were mounted in a single preparation. Similarly, it would be necessary to provide not only (as in the proposal submitted) for species having separate sexual forms but also for species which did not have such forms.

(b) A Declaratory Article should be inserted in the *Règles* stating that type specimens of the categories now to be defined were the property of science. Such an Article would be of value in reminding the owners of type specimens of the responsibilities incurred by such ownership.

(c) The categories of type specimens which it was desirable should be recognised and defined in the *Règles* were those which possessed a direct nomenclatorial significance, namely holotypes, syntypes and lectotypes. It was not necessary to recognise paratypes, for, although paratypes were of great practical value in many ways, they possessed no nomenclatorial significance, since in any given case they came into existence only when a holotype was designated or a lectotype selected.

(d) It was to be hoped that after the introduction of the scheme outlined above zoologists would abandon the use of the vague expression " type ".

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

(e) The question whether provision should be made for the recognition in the *Règles* of the category " neotype " should be deferred until the Commission had had an opportunity to consider the proposals submitted in Point (16) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12.

(f) The provisions to be inserted in the *Règles* should cover type specimens of species, subspecies and infra-subspecific forms.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that the inadequate provisions regarding type specimens inserted in the *Appendice* in the second sentence of Section " A " and between Sections " A " and " B ", by the Ninth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Monaco in 1913 should be deleted ;

(2) that there should be added either a new Article or as additions to Article 31 :—

(a) recognising and defining as follows the under-mentioned categories of type specimens :—

Category	*Definition of category.*
Holotype ..	The single specimen designated or indicated as "the type" by the original author at the time of the publication of the original description.
Syntype ..	One of a number of specimens of equal nomenclatorial rank which formed all or part of the material before the original author, in those cases where that author did not designate or indicate a holotype.
Lectotype ..	A single specimen selected, subsequent to the publication of the original description, from a series of syntypes to be "the type", such selection, in order to be effective, to be a selection made known through being announced in a publication;

(b) making it clear for the purposes of (a) above that it is immaterial whether the specimen designated as the holotype or selected as the lectotype is a separately mounted specimen or is mounted with other specimens in a single preparation provided, in the latter case, that for this purpose a single specimen is distinguished in some appropriate manner from the other specimens included in the preparation.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 73)

(3) that the expressions recognised in (2) above be substituted, as appropriate, for the expression "type", wherever that expression is used in the *Règles* in relation to a type specimen ;

(4) that a Declaratory Article should be inserted in the *Règles* declaring that holotypes, syntypes and lectotypes are the property of science and should be so regarded by zoologists ;

(5) that the provisions specified in (2) to (4) should apply to the type specimens of all nominal forms belonging to the categories species, subspecies and infra-subspecific form ;

(6) that a *Recommandation* should be added to the Declaratory Article specified in (4) above, strongly urging every author who publishes a description of, and gives a new name to, a species or who selects a lectotype from a series of syntypes of a species which had previously been described and named, to deposit the holotype or, as the case may be, the lectotype, of that species in a museum or other institution where the specimen will be safely preserved and will be accessible for purposes of research ;

(7) that the following *Recommandations* be inserted at appropriate points in the *Règles* :—

(a) a *Recommandation* strongly urging that every author who publishes a description of, and gives a new name to, a species should clearly designate a single specimen (of either but not both sexes, in the case of animals having separate sexes, and of one, but not more than one, developmental stage or form, in the case of species having distinct developmental stages or more than one form) to be the holotype of that species, and should indicate in the original description (1) the full locality and other data on the label attached to that specimen, (2) in the case of animals having separate sexes, the sex of the specimen so selected, (3) in the case of a species having distinct developmental stages or more than one form, the stage or form to which the specimen so selected is referable, (4) in the case of parasitic species, the name of the host species (5) the name of the collector by whom the specimen was obtained, (6) the collection in which the holotype is deposited and the collection number assigned to the specimen, (7) in the case of living terrestial species, the elevation in metres above sea level, and in the case of living marine species, the depth in metres below sea level, at which the holotype was taken and (8) in the case of fossil species, the estimated geological age of the species, measured, if possible, by the number of metres by which the spot where the holotype was found lies above, or below, a well-established plane ;

(b) a *Recommandation* strongly urging that, where, in default of a holotype having been designated or indicated by the original author of a name, the same or another author later selects from a series of syntypes a specimen to be the lectotype, that author should observe the principles specified in the opening portion of the *Recommandation* set out in (a) above and, in publishing the selection so made, should give the particulars numbered (1) to (8) in the said *Recommandation* ;

(c) a *Recommandation* strongly urging every author who :—

(i) publishes a description of, and gives a new name to, a species should affix to the specimen designated as the holotype a conspicuous label indicating that the said specimen has been so designated ;

(ii) in default of a holotype having been designated or indicated by the original author, selects a lectotype from a series of syntypes, should affix to the specimen so selected to be the lectotype, a conspicuous label indicating that the specimen in question has been so selected ;

(8) that the *Recommandations* specified in (7) above should apply to the holotypes and lectotypes of subspecies and infra-subspecific forms in like manner as to those of species.

Consideration of points (15) to (20) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12 postponed until the Seventh Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session

76. On the proposal of the Acting President, THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to defer until their next meeting (i.e. their Seventh Meeting) the consideration of the remaining Points (Points (15) to (20)) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12.

Seventh and Eighth Meetings of the Commission during its Paris Session : date and time appointed

77. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) proposed that the Commission should meet again that evening at 2030 hours for the purpose of completing their consideration of Commission Paper I.C.(48)12 and of considering Commission Paper I.C.(48)14. On the following day, Friday, 23rd July, 1948, a meeting of the Commission would be held at 0900 hours, concurrently with the first meeting of the Section on Nomenclature.

THE COMMISSION took note of, and approved, the above arrangements.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned at* 1910 *hours.*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 21st–27th July, 1948

CONCLUSIONS of the Seventh Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Thursday, 22nd July, 1948, at 2030 hours

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
Professor E. Beltrán (Mexico)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present :

Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (U.S.A.)
Professor E. Raymond Hall (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*
Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer*

Terminology of type specimens : proposed additional "Recommandation"

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 75)

1. Before continuing their consideration of Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, THE COMMISSION reverted to the question of the terminology of type specimens, on which they had reached certain conclusions shortly before the close of their previous meeting. The point raised was concerned with the use of the expression " co-type." On this the view was expressed that it was desirable to discourage the use of this expression, the meaning of which had now become ambiguous, in view of the fact that, while many authors used this expression in a sense identical with that of " syntype," there were numerous authors who used this expression as though it had the same meaning as the expression " paratype." A *Recommandation* deprecating the use of this expression should be added to the Article enumerating the names of the categories of type specimens to be recognised for nomenclatorial purposes which it had been agreed to recommend should be inserted in the *Règles*.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should be added to the new Article enumerating the categories of type specimens to be recognised for nomenclatorial purposes which, as agreed by the Commission at the Sixth Meeting of their Paris Session (Conclusion 75(2)), was to be proposed for addition to the *Règles*, a *Recommandation* urging authors, in the interest of avoiding misunderstanding, to refrain from using the expression " co-type."

Need for provision for naming of nominotypical subspecies

2. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) relating to the trivial name of the nominotypical subspecies of a species having two or more subspecies submitted in Point (15) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12. It was pointed out that, although the *Règles* contained a provision (Article 9) regarding the name to be applied to the typical subgenus of a genus in which two or more subgenera are recognised, there was no provision relating to the parallel problem presented by the typical subspecies of a species having two or more subspecies (the nominotypical subspecies). This was an anomaly which should be corrected.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that there should be inserted in the *Règles* a new Article making it obligatory to apply to the typical subspecies of a species having two or more subspecies (to be known as the nominotypical subspecies) the same trivial name as that of the species itself ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 1(18))

(2) that an appropriate reference to the new Article referred to in (1) above should be inserted in the provision to be inserted in the *Règles* exempting the trivial name of the nominotypical subspecies from liability to rejection as a homonym of the trivial name of the species concerned.

Neotypes : proposed recognition as a category of type specimens : Secretary to prepare comprehensive report on

3. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal for the recognition in the *Règles* of the category " neotype " submitted by Dr. Don L. Frizzell and Dr. Harry E. Wheeler, the text of which had already been published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 106–108) (file Z.N.(S.)24), together with a note on certain of the problems raised by this proposal by the Secretary to the Commission (see 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 108–111) and the suggestions as to the best approach to be made to this subject submitted in Point (16) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note that there was considerable difference of opinion among zoologists regarding the desirability of inserting provisions in the *Règles* recognising the category " neotype," some workers, particularly in palaeontology, being strongly in favour of this course, while others were opposed to it on the ground that the recognition of this category would be likely to give rise to abuses (commercial and other) and to lead to greater confusion than uniformity ;

(2) agreed :—

(a) that the proposal to recognise the category " neotype " raised complex problems which required much closer and more detailed study than had yet been given to them ;

(b) that, if the Congress were to be recommended to recognise the category " neotype," it would be essential that the proposals so submitted should be comprehensive in character and should contain adequate safeguards against the abuse of the new provisions by mercenary or irresponsible persons ;

(c) that, in view both of the intrinsic difficulties involved in the proposed recognition of the category " neotype " and of the wide differences of opinion on the subject which at present existed among zoologists, it was essential that further discussions should be held with interested groups of specialists before the Commission submitted any recommendation to the Congress for the amendment of the *Règles* to deal with this subject ;

(3) agreed to recommend :—

that the Secretary to the Commission should be invited to make a thorough study, in conjunction with interested specialists, of the problems involved in the proposal that the category " neotype " should be recognised in the *Règles* and to submit a Report thereon, with recommendations, for consideration by the Commission at their meeting to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress, with a view to the submission by the Commission of a considered statement of their views on this subject and, if they decided in favour of recommending that the foregoing category of type specimen should be recognised in the *Règles*, of a comprehensive scheme to that end.

Misuse of the "Règles" in a manner calculated to give political, religious or personal offence : measures to prevent

4. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by a large number of Brazilian zoologists that means should be found to provide against the risk of the *Règles* being used for the purpose of giving personal offence, a misuse which it was alleged had recently occurred in their own country in a particular instance (file Z.N.(S.)348), together with proposals for dealing with the above problem submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in Point (17) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12. The Secretary, while agreeing with the view expressed by the applicants that it was desirable that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* to deal with the misuse of the *Règles* in this way, suggested that this provision should be so drafted as to cover cases of the use of zoological nomenclature in a manner calculated to give not only personal offence but also offence either on political or religious grounds. Legal advice might be needed in the application of the proposed provision.

THE COMMISSION

(1) agreed to place on record their strong disapproval of the use of the *Règles* in any manner calculated to give offence on political, religious or personal grounds ;

(2) agreed to recommend that there should be inserted in the *Règles* provisions to the following effect :—

(a) The use for a generic or subgeneric name or for the trivial name of a species, subspecies or infra-subspecific form of a word (whether simple or compound) which can reasonably be regarded, in any language, as calculated to give offence on political, religious or personal grounds is prohibited.

(b) No name published in contravention of the provisions of (a) above is to possess any status in zoological nomenclature

(c) It shall be open to any person or group of persons who is, or are, of the opinion that a given name has been published in contravention of the provisions of the present

Article to refer the question to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, and it shall be the duty of the said Commission promptly to consider every case so submitted to it, and, if satisfied that the submission is well-grounded, to order the name concerned to be suppressed for all purposes, in accordance with the provisions of (b) above.

(d) The procedure to be followed by the Commission in considering applications submitted under (c) above shall be governed by such regulations as the Commission may from time to time prescribe.

The " Regles " : proposed drafting amendments to secure greater clarity and to eliminate unnecessary and undefined repetitive phrases

5. THE COMMISSION had under consideration proposals (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted by the Secretary in Points (18), (19) and (20) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, for the improvement of the *Règles* by the insertion of certain minor drafting amendments designed to secure greater clarity or to eliminate the unnecessary and therefore misleading use of two or more undefined expressions to denote the same concept.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that, when the jurists were requested to embody in the *Règles* such amendments and other changes as might be agreed upon by the present Congress, they should at the same time be requested to make such minor drafting changes as might be necessary :—

(a) to secure that in the mandatory portions of the *Règles* nouns should, for the sake of clarity, be used, wherever possible, in the singular number in preference to the plural number, thereby eliminating anomalies such as those presented by the wording at present employed in the opening phrase of Article 20 and in the corresponding phrase of Article 30 ;

(b) to remove verbal inconsistencies in drafting such as the indiscriminate use in Article 30 of the phrases " type species," " generic type " and "type" to denote the same concept and the use in the same Article of the expression "publication" (in Rules (a) and (b)) and the expression " proposed " (Rule (c)) to denote exactly the same idea ;

(c) to delete unnecessary and undefined repetitive expressions such as the expressions " *seu* diagnosis; *seu* definition; *seu* condensed description " used in Proviso (c)(1) to Article 25 as synonyms of the expression " summary of characters " and the expressions " *seu* genotype; *seu* autogenotype; *seu* orthotype " used in Proviso (c)(3) to the same Article as synonyms of the expression " type species."

Miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the "Règles": second instalment

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 60)

6. THE COMMISSION had before them a memorandum by the Secretary (Commission Paper I.C.(48)14) containing a second instalment of miscellaneous proposals received from various sources for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles*. For convenience of reference these proposals, which were twelve in number, had been numbered consecutively with the proposals brought forward in the paper containing the first instalment (Commission Paper I.C.(48)12). The present proposals were therefore numbered (21) to (32).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to examine Commission Paper I.C.(48)14, point by point, for the purpose of reaching conclusions regarding the recommendations to be submitted on the questions raised therein.

Article 8 (case of a generic name treated as a noun in the nominative singular but which was in fact a latinised version of a noun in another language in a case other than the nominative or a number other than the singular)

7. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by Commissioner H. Boschma designed to secure the incorporation in Article 8 of a provision to cover the case of a generic name which, though published by its original author as a noun substantive in the nominative singular, was in fact a latinised version of a word in some other language, where the word so used was in some case other than the nominative or some number other than the singular (file Z.N.(S.)223), together with a note on the same subject, submitted in Point (21) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

It was explained that the kind of case here contemplated was that presented by the generic name *Potamon* Savigny, 1816, which, though published by its original author as a noun substantive in the nominative singular, was in fact a latinised version of the Greek word Ποταμων, i.e., of the genitive plural of the Greek noun Ποταμος, having thus the meaning " of rivers." It would be unreasonable to reject a generic name formed in this way on the ground that it had not been published in the nominative singular. If such rejection were to be avoided, it would be necessary to

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 12)

insert a saving clause in Article 8, in view of the decision already taken that the substance of the interpretation of Article 8 given in *Opinion* 183 should be incorporated in that Article.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that there should be added to Article 8 of the *Règles*, when amended in the manner agreed upon at the Sixth Meeting of the Commission during their present Session (Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 12), a Proviso making it clear that a generic name which was treated by its original author as a latinised noun in the nominative singular is not to be rejected as invalid on the sole ground that it consists of a latinised version of a word or combination of words belonging to any language other than Latin, the word or words as so used being, prior to latinisation, in some case other than the nominative or some number other than the singular or in both case and number other than the nominative singular.

Article 14 (addition of a " Recommandation " urging authors to avoid giving as new trivial names words already so used in allied groups)

8. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) that a *Recommandation* should be added to Article 14 urging authors not to select for the trivial names of species and subspecies words already published as the names of species or subspecies in allied groups and indicating the criteria recommended to be followed by authors in this matter (file Z.N.(S.)352), together with a note on the foregoing proposal submitted by the Secretary in Point (22) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

There was general agreement that the selection as new trivial names of such words as *vulgaris*, *domesticus*, *niger*, *silvestris*, etc., was liable to give rise to confusion when those names had already been published as the trivial names of species and subspecies in allied groups, even when the words could properly be used in this way in the sense that such employment did not involve a breach of the Law of Homonymy. It was felt, however, that no advantage would be served by attempting to specify in the proposed *Recommandation* the exact limits within which the publication of trivial names already published for species and subspecies in allied groups should be avoided.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that there should be added to Article 14 a *Recommandation* urging authors when selecting trivial names for new species or subspecies or when selecting such

names as substitutes for names which are invalid under the Law of Homonymy, to refrain from selecting words already published as the trivial names of species or subspecies occurring in any part of the world, where the species concerned are referred to genera allied to that to which the species or subspecies to be named is assigned.

Article 15 (proposed redrafting of, to eliminate the existing option to link by hyphens the components of a trivial name consisting of a compound word)

9. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) that Article 15 should be re-drafted in such a way as to eliminate the option contained in this Article in its present form, under which it is legitimate to use as the trivial name of a species or subspecies a combination of words linked together by a hyphen (file Z.N.(S.)352), together with a note on the foregoing proposal submitted by the Secretary in Point (23) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

The object of Professor Bonnet's proposal was not to prohibit the use of combinations of words as the trivial names of species and subspecies, but to secure that, when names were formed in this way, the two words forming the combination should be written as one and should not be linked together merely by a hyphen. It was generally felt that the object sought was desirable but that, in the form in which it was actually submitted, the proposal was too far-reaching: there were certain trivial names which were deliberately designed to show that the species so named possessed a distinguishing mark in the form of a letter (e.g. the trivial name *c-album* published by Linnaeus as *Papilio c-album* in 1758, for a butterfly which was distinguished by having on the under-side of the hindwing a white mark in the form of the letter " c "). It would clearly be undesirable to require that this name should be printed as " *calbum* " instead of " *c-album.*" It was suggested also that the present opportunity should be taken to make it clear that, where a binominal author introduces a new trivial name consisting of a compound word and that trivial name, on being first published, is incorrectly printed as though it consisted of two words, it is not on that account to be rejected but is to be corrected by later authors in the same way as names incorrectly formed under Articles 14-16, 18 or 20. For example the trivial name *novæ hispaniae* published by Gmelin in 1789 for a species of *Coluber* should not be rejected but should be corrected to *novaehispaniae.*

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that words should be inserted in Article 15 to make it clear that, where a trivial name is formed from a combination of words, those words are to be

treated as constituting a single word and are not to be merely united together by a hyphen, save that, where a trivial name has been formed for the purpose of indicating that the taxonomic unit concerned is distinguished from other such units by a mark having the form of a letter of the Latin alphabet (for example, a name such as *c-album*), the letter of the alphabet forming the first portion of the name is to be separated from the remaining portion of the name by the interposition of a hyphen ;

(2) that either in Article 15 or elsewhere in the *Règles* as may be found appropriate there should be inserted words to make it clear that, where an author who in the book or paper concerned has duly applied the principles of binominal nomenclature, as required by proviso (b) to Article 25, publishes a trivial name consisting of a compound word, which, on being so first published, is printed as though it consisted of two separate words (for example the trivial name *novae hispaniae* Gmelin, 1789), that name is not on that account to be rejected but is to be treated as though it had been duly published as a single compound word (e.g. *novaehispaniae*) ;

(3) that, where a trivial name is published in a manner which contravenes either (1) or (2) above, that name is automatically to be corrected by subsequent authors, and shall rank for purposes of priority as from the original author and date of publication in accordance with the provision relating to the correction of names published in contravention of Articles 14–16, 18 and 20 agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 5)

Article 15 (orthography of compound trivial names, where the first part of the compound consists of a number)

10. In the course of the discussion on the item recorded in the preceding conclusion, the attention of the Commission was drawn to the anomalous position which existed in the case of the trivial names of species where the name was a compound name and the first part was a number. There were many such names, for the presence of a specified number of markings of a given kind often constituted a good diagnostic character. Such names were often formed in combination with adjectives such as *guttatus*, *signatus*, etc. In some cases the number forming the first part of the name was indicated by its Latin name, while in other cases it was often indicated by the Arabic numerical sign appropriate for the number in question. Thus, the same name might sometimes appear as "*quattuor-guttatus*" (or "*quattuorguttatus*") or as "4-*guttatus*."

The view was expressed that, as zoological nomenclature consisted of a system in which Latin words were used in particular ways and not of a system of numerals, it was wrong in principle to employ as a trivial name a hybrid designation such as "4-*guttatus*," which consisted partly of a numeral and partly of a word. Quite apart from this important theoretical objection, there were also important practical objections to the use of names formed in the oregoing manner. Names so formed, were, for example, a source of difficulty to those zoologists who possessed no knowledge of the Latin language: they led to errors and inconsistencies in the alphabetisation of trivial names and, in extreme cases, were responsible, in conversation, for such verbal monstrosities as "*four-guttatus*," "*eleven-signatus*," etc. Moreover, the use of names written in this way led to difficulties in the application both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy. For example, there were cases of trivial names originally published as say "4-maculatus" of which the numeral had sometimes been (correctly) transliterated as a cardinal number (i.e. as *quattuor*), while at other times it had been treated as an ordinal number, the form "quadri-" being adopted.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should be inserted in the *Règles*, either in Article 15 or elsewhere, a provision or provisions making it clear :—

(a) that, where the trivial name selected for a species, subspecies or infra-subspecific form is a compound word, constructed so as to indicate that the taxonomic unit concerned may be recognised by a specified number of characteristics or by the presence of a specified number of examples of a given characteristic and the first portion of the name is intended to denote the number of characteristics in question or the number of examples of a given characteristic in question, as the case may be, that portion of the name is to be indicated by the Latin word representing the cardinal number concerned (as, for example, "*quattuorguttatus*") and is not to be indicated by a numeral (as, for example, 4-*guttatus*");

(b) that, where a trivial name of the kind specified in (a) above has been, or is, published with the first part of the name indicated by a numeral instead of by a word indicating the cardinal number concerned :—

(i) the name in question is automatically to be corrected by subsequent authors, the two words of which such a name, when so corrected, is composed being printed as a single word and not united merely by a hyphen ; and

(ii) the name so corrected is to rank for the purposes of the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy as from the date on which it was originally published in the incorrect form and is to be attributed to the author by whom it was so published, in like manner as trivial names when corrected to comply with the provisions of Articles 14–16, 18 or 20.

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 5)

Article 14 (clarification of provisions relating to the formation of trivial names based upon the names of persons)

11. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) suggested that at this point the Commission should consider a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) for the clarification of the provisions in Article 14 relating to the formation of trivial names in those cases where it was desired to give honour to some person by using his or her name as the basis of the trivial name. As all systematic workers knew from experience, the existing portion of Article 14 dealing with this matter was both badly worded and also incomplete. The proposals submitted by Professor Bonnet could be summarised as follows :—

(a) Trivial names in the genitive case which are based (1) upon the names of personages of antiquity or (2) upon the prénoms (as contrasted with the surnames) of modern personages, whether living or dead, should follow the rules of Latin declension in those cases where the names in question were of Latin origin ;

(b) Trivial names based on the surnames of modern personages, whether living or dead, including surnames derived from words of Latin origin, should, subject to the exceptions noted in (c), (d) and (e) below, consist, as at present, of the exact surname of the person concerned to which should be added the appropriate termination in the genitive case, the terminations in question being :—

(i) the termination " *-i* " where the trivial name is based on the name of a man ;

  (ii) the termination "*-ae*" where the trivial name is based on the name of a woman;

  (iii) the termination "*-orum*" where the trivial name is based on the name of two or more men, each having the same surname;

  (iv) the termination "*-arum*" where the trivial name is based on the names of two or more women, each having the same surname;

(c) Where a trivial name is based upon the name of a modern personage and that personage is a woman whose surname ends in the letter "a", the trivial name based thereon should be formed by substituting the termination "*-ae*" for the termination "*-a*";

(d) Where a trivial name is based upon the surname of any of the following modern personages, that name should be formed as follows:—

Modern surname (1)	*Trivial name based on surname in column* (1) (2)
Linnaeus or Linné	*linnaei* (not *linnaeusi* or *linnei*)
Fabricius	*fabricii* (not *fabriciusi*)
Poda	*podae* (not *podai*)

(e) Where a trivial name is based upon the surname of a modern personage and that surname ends with the letter "q", the letter "u" is to be inserted immediately after the letter "q" and before the appropriate genitival termination;

(f) Where a trivial name is based upon the surname of a modern personage and that surname is preceded by a nobiliar particle (e.g. the particle "de," "di," "von," etc.), that particle is to be omitted when forming the trivial name in question (the correct form for a trivial name based, for example, upon the modern surname "de Lessert" thus being *lesserti* not *delesserti*), save in those cases:—

  (i) where the particle is actually attached to the modern surname in question (as in the case of the surname "Dujardin") or where, by long custom, it forms an integral portion of the surname (as in the case of the surname "De Geer"), in either of which cases the particle is to be retained when forming a trivial name based upon the surname in question (the correct form for trivial names based upon the modern surnames cited in the foregoing examples being in the first case *dujardini* (not *jardini*) and in the second case *degeeri* (not *geeri*);

(ii) where the particle consists either of the letters " Mac " or " Mc " or the letter " O " followed, in the latter case, by an apostrophe, in either of which cases the particle and, in the second case, the apostrophe also, is to be retained when forming a trivial name based upon the surname in question, the first letter of the portion of the surname following the particle being written with a small letter (trivial names based upon the modern surnames MacCook and O'Connor thus taking the forms *maccooki* and *o'connori* respectively);

(g) Where a trivial name is based upon a modern surname commencing with the particle " Mc," the letter " a " should be inserted between the letter " m " and the letter " c ";

(h) Where a trivial name is based upon a modern French surname and that surname is preceded by the definite article (" le," " la " or " les ") (as in the case of the surname " Le Sueur "), the definite article is to be incorporated in the trivial name (the correct form of trivial name in the example cited above thus being *lesueuri*, not *sueuri*);

(i) Where a trivial name is based upon a modern French surname and that name is preceded first by the particle "de" and second by the definite article "la", the definite article is to be incorporated in the trivial name but not the particle " de " (the correct form for a trivial name based on the surname "de la Roche" thus being *larochei* not *delarochei*);

(j) Where a trivial name is based upon the surname of a modern personage and that surname consists of two surnames linked together by a hyphen, one only of the two names in question should be selected when forming the trivial name in question, preference being given to the better known of the two surnames in question (for example, in forming a trivial name based on the surname of the French naturalist Guérin-Méneville, preference should normally be given to the name Guérin, by which this naturalist was commonly known, rather than to Méneville, the trivial name formed being thus *guérini*, though the trivial name *ménevillei* would also be permissible)

(k) Where a trivial name is based upon the name of a Christian Saint, the qualifying adjective (Saint, Sainte, Sancti, Sancto, San, etc.) should be excluded from the trivial name, a trivial name based upon the name of Saint Remy thus taking the form *remyi*).

In the discussion which ensued the following points were made :—

(i) *Proposal* (*a*) : The first part of this proposal dealt with a matter which was already covered by Article 14, though only inferentially, and it was certainly desirable that an express provision should be inserted to deal with it. The second part of this proposal dealt with a matter on which the *Règles* were at present silent. It was certainly a defect that no distinction should be made in Article 14 between "prénoms" on the one hand and surnames on the other in the case of names of modern personages where those names were selected to form the basis of a trivial name. The proposal submitted was desirable and should be accepted. It would be necessary for the new Article to deal separately with names of Latin and Greek origin and to provide that the latter should follow the rules of Greek declension.

(ii) *Proposal* (*b*) : This proposal was in the main a restatement of the existing provision in Article 14. It was however an improvement on the existing text, both because it made it clear that the provisions in question applied only to the surnames of modern personages and also because it gave clearer and more precise directions regarding the terminations to be attached to the end of a modern surname, when it was decided to use that surname as the basis of a trivial name formed in the genitive case. It was pointed out, however, that there was one situation which had not been covered, namely where it was desired to form a trivial name based upon the surname of two or more persons and those persons were of different sex. Clearly, in such a case the normal rule of Latin grammar should be applied and the termination to be selected should be in the masculine gender. This should be made clear when Article 14 is redrafted.

(iii) *Proposal* (c) : The question raised in this proposal required consideration, for although the addition of the "-ae" to a feminine name which ended in the letter "a" was both inharmonious and anomalous, it was felt that further study of the implications of the proposal was desirable before a recommendation on this subject was submitted to the Congress.

(iv) *Proposal* (*d*): This proposal was warmly welcomed, it being felt that it would be absurd to insist that a trivial name based upon the name of Linnaeus should take the form *linnaeusi*, though, as the name Linnaeus was a modern surname, this was what was required by the existing provisions of Article 14. It was obvious that special provision would need to be made for exceptional cases of this kind. It was likely that experience would show the need for adding to the list of exceptions in this matter.

(v) *Proposal* (*e*): This proposal was also warmly welcomed. It was a barbarism, in any system of nomenclature which purported to use the Latin language to permit the existence of words in which the letter "q" was followed by any letter other than the letter "u". The fact that this matter was not dealt with in the existing text of the *Régles* was no doubt due to inadvertence on the part of the original draftsmen.

(vi) *Proposal* (*f*): A long discussion took place on the first part of this proposal. It was agreed that in principle the proposal was well founded but the evidence brought forward showed that in some languages (for example, in Italian) it would be impossible in practice to apply a provision of the kind suggested. The second part of this proposal met with general approval.

(vii) *Proposal* (*g*): It was considered that, although logical, this proposal was misconceived, for it was explained that it was often no matter of accident whether a surname of the class in question started with the letters "Mac" or "Mc". It was agreed however that it should be made clear at an appropriate point in the *Régles* that, where the foregoing was the only difference in spelling between two surnames, the publication of a trivial name based upon one such name (say, the trivial name *maccooki* based upon the surname MacCook) would render invalid as a homonym a later published trivial name based upon the other surname (e.g. a name *mccooki* based upon the name McCook would in such circumstances be invalid).

(viii) *Proposal* (*h*) : General agreement was expressed with this proposal. It should be extended to cover modern surnames of French origin as well as modern French surnames.

(ix) *Proposal* (*i*) : It was felt that further study of the probable effects of a rule of the kind proposed was desirable before a proposal thereon was submitted to the Congress.

(x) *Proposal* (*j*) : This proposal was logical but it was considered that in this case also further study was required before a proposal was submitted to the Congress. It would be necessary to co-ordinate any provision on the lines suggested with the existing provisions relating to the formation of trivial names based upon the names of places. It would probably be found that, while there were many trivial names based upon the names of places (e.g. St. Helena), the first portion of which, when Latinised, started with the adjective *sanctus* or *sancta* (as in Sancta Helena), the number of trivial names actually selected for the purpose of honouring Saints was very small.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) agreed to recommend that Article 14 should be redrafted to such extent as might be necessary to provide :—

(a) that a trivial name formed in the genitive case which is based either (i) upon the name of a personage of Classical Antiquity (including gods, goddesses and mythological characters) or (ii) upon a "prènom" (i.e. any name borne by a person in addition to his or her surname) of a modern personage, whether living or dead, in any case where that first name is of Latin or Greek origin, should follow the rules of Latin declension in the case of a name of Latin origin and the rules of Greek declension in the case of a name of Greek origin ;

(b) that a trivial name based upon the surname of a modern personage, whether living or dead, including a trivial name based upon a surname of Latin or Greek origin, should, subject to the provisions of (c) and (d) below, consist of the exact surname of the person concerned, to which should be added the appropriate termination in the genitive case, that is to say :—

(i) in the case of a trivial name based on the surname of a man, the termination " -i " ;

(ii) in the case of a trivial name based on the surname of a woman, the termination " -ae " ;

(iii) in the case of a trivial name based on the surname of two or more persons having the same surname, where one or more of the persons is a man, the termination " -orum " ;

(iv) in the case of a trivial name based on the surname of two or more persons having the same surname, where all the persons concerned are women, the termination " -arum " ;

(c) that, where a trivial name is based upon the surname of any of the undermentioned modern personages, that name should be formed as follows :—

Surname of modern personage (1)	*Trivial name based on surname specified in Column* (1) (2)
Linnaeus (Linné)	*linnaei* (not *linnaeusi* or *linnei*)
Fabricius	*fabricii* (not *fabriciusi*)
Poda	*podae* (not *podai*)

(d) that, where a trivial name is based upon the surname of a modern personage and that surname ends with the letter " q ", the letter " u " is to be inserted between the letter " q " and the appropriate genitival termination ;

(e) that, where a trivial name is based upon the surname of a modern personage and the first portion of that surname consists either (i) of the particle " Mac " or " Mc " or (ii) of a particle composed of the letter " O " followed by an apostrophe, the particle, in the first case, and the particle and the apostrophe in the second case, is to be retained in the trivial name, the first letter of the remaining portion of the surname being written with a small letter, trivial names based, for example, on the modern surnames "MacCook" and "O'Connor" thus taking the form of *maccooki* and *o'connori* respectively;

(f) that, where a trivial name is based upon a modern French surname or upon a modern surname of French origin and that surname is preceded by the definite article ("le", "la", or "les") (as in the surname, "Le Sueur"), the definite article is to be incorporated in the trivial name (the correct form of a trivial name based on the surname cited in the foregoing example thus being *lesueuri* not *sueuri*);

(2) agreed to postpone for further consideration the undermentioned proposals :—

(a) that, where a trivial name is based upon the surname of a modern personage and that personage is a woman whose surname ends in the letter "a", the trivial name so based should be formed by substituting the termination "-ae" for the existing termination "-a";

(b) that, where a trivial name is based upon a modern French surname or upon a modern surname of French origin and that surname is preceded first by the particle "de" and second by the definite article "la", the definite article is to be incorporated in the trivial name but not the particle "de", the correct form of a trivial name based, for example, on the French surname "De la Roche" thus being *larochei* not *delarochei*;

(c) that, where a trivial name is based upon the name of a Christian Saint, the qualifying adjective *sanctus* should be omitted from the trivial name, the correct form of the trivial name based, for example, on the name of St. Remy thus being *remyi*;

(3) agreed to reject the undermentioned proposals :—

(a) that, where a trivial name is based upon the surname of a modern personage and that surname is preceded by a nobiliar particle (e.g. the particle "de", "di", "von", etc.), that particle is to be omitted when forming the trivial name (the correct form of a trivial name based, for example, on the modern surname "de Lessert" thus being *lesserti* not *delesserti*), save in those cases where the particle is actually attached to the modern surname in question (as, for example, in the case of the surname "Dujardin") or, where, by long custom, it forms an integral portion of the surname (as, for example, in the case of the surname "De Geer"), in either of which cases the particle is to be retained when forming a trivial based thereon, the correct form for trivial names based, for example, on the modern surnames cited above being in the first case *dujardini* (not *jardini*) and in the second case *degeeri* (not *geeri*);

(b) that, where a trivial name is based upon the surname of a modern personage which commences with the particle "Mc", the letter "a" should be inserted between the letter "m" and the letter "c";

(4) agreed to recommend that provision should be made in the Article which was to replace the existing Article 35 to secure that, where a trivial name is based upon the surname of a modern personage, the first part of which consists of the particle "Mac" or "Mc", as the case may be, the trivial name so formed is to be rejected as a homonym if there is a species or subspecies which was either originally described, or is now placed, in the same genus, which is based upon the surname of another modern personage which is identical with the surname on which the later published trivial name is based, save that the first part of the surname consists, as the case may be, of the particle "Mc" or the particle "Mac" and that a corresponding addition should be made to Article 34 in relation to generic names so formed;

(5) agreed to recommend that a *Recommandation* should be added to Article 15, urging any author, when proposing to publish a trivial name based upon the surname of a modern personage, whose surname is a compound name consisting

of two surnames, whether or not, linked together by a hyphen, to give serious consideration, in the interests of brevity in nomenclature, to the possibility of basing the trivial name upon one only of the two surnames of which the compound surname is composed, and, if this course is found to be feasible, to give preference to whichever is the better known of the surnames in question (for example, if it were decided to base a trivial name upon the surname " Guérin-Méneville " but to make use for this purpose of one only of the surnames of which that compound surname is composed, preference should be given to the name "-Guérin " by which this French naturalist was commonly known rather than to the name " Méneville ", the trivial name selected being thus *guérini*, though the trivial name *ménevillei* would in such a case also be permissible.)

Seventeen propositions submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France): review of position regarding

12. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) suggested that it would be convenient if at this stage the Commission were to review the position reached in regard to the propositions, seventeen in number, which had been submitted to them by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) for consideration, if possible, during the present (Paris) Session. The propositions in question[1] were concerned with the following matters :—

(1) the question whether the names published in Clerck's *Aranei svecici* should be made available for nomenclatorial purposes, notwithstanding the fact that they were published in 1757, i.e. before the starting point of zoological nomenclature as prescribed in Article 26 of the *Règles* (file Z.N. (S.) 238) ;

(2) the insertion in the *Règles* of a provision recognising a Law of Prescription which would prevent the Law of Priority from upsetting well-established names in favour of names which had long been forgotten (file Z.N. (S.) 359) ;

(3) the partial suspension of the Law of Homonymy for the purpose of protecting well-established generic names (file Z.N. (S.) 359) ;

(4) the deletion from Article 13 of the option to use a capital when writing the first letter of certain trivial names (file Z.N. (S.) 352) ;

---

[1] For the text of Professor Bonnet's propositions, see 1950 , *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 171–199.

(5) the insertion in Articles 14 and 15 of provisions designed to remove certain ambiguities and to fill in certain gaps (file Z.N. (S.) 352);

(6) the insertion of a *Recommandation* in Article 11, urging authors not to publish trivial names consisting of words already used as such for species in allied genera, families or Orders (file Z.N. (S.) 352);

(7) the deletion from Article 15 of the option to use a hyphen joining together the two parts of a compound trivial name (file Z.N. (S. 352);

(8) the insertion of three new Articles dealing with the formation of compound trivial names (file Z.N. (S.) 390);

(9) the agreement of trivial names, when adjectives, with the gender of the generic names with which they combined (file Z.N. (S.) 352);

(10) the insertion in the *Règles* of a new Article dealing with polymorphism of certain words used as trivial names (file Z.N. (S.) 356);

(11) the need for co-ordination of the provisions of Articles 19 and 32 of the *Règles* (file Z.N. (S.) 352);

(12) the need for avoiding the selection, as names, of words which were either inharmonious or unduly long or which carried a bizarre meaning (files Z.N. (S.) 297 and 352);

(13) the amendment and clarification of Article 22 (file Z.N. (S.) 352);

(14) the deletion from Article 14 of the obsolete *Recommandation* relating to the abbreviation of authors' names (file Z.N. (S.) 352);

(15) the addition to Article 14 of a provision relating to the formation of adjectival trivial names having a geographical meaning and ending in the termination "-ensis" (file Z.N. (S.) 391);

(16) the modification of the *Recommandation* to Article 20 of the *Règles* (file Z.N. (S.) 392);

(17) a minor amendment of the document which at present figures as Section "F" of the *Appendice* to the *Règles* (file Z.N. (S.) 393).

Continuing, the Acting President said that, in view of the importance of, and the wide interest taken in, Professor Bonnet's Proposition 1, he proposed in his capacity as President of the Section, to call upon Professor Bonnet to make a statement on Clerck's Arachnid names at an early meeting of the Section. He further proposed that, in the light of the general discussion so afforded, the Commission should consider this proposal in detail at a later meeting during the present Session. Professor Bonnet's Propositions 2 and 3 were closely related to one another and could be conveniently considered together with the proposal on the same subject which stood in the name of Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark). These three proposals would, therefore, be considered in the first instance at a meeting of the Section on Nomenclature, after which the Commission would be asked to formulate recommendations for the approval of the Section. The Commission had already taken decisions on the issues raised in Professor Bonnet's Propositions 4 and 14 and on the first and third parts of his Proposition 12, when they had had Paper I.C.(48) 11 under consideration, while Propositions 5, 6, and 7 and been dealt with at the present meeting. He (the Acting President) proposed to deal, in papers shortly to be circulated in the I.C.(48) series, with Professor Bonnet's Propositions 9, 11, 13, and the second part of his Proposition 12. He suggested therefore that the consideration of these Propositions should be deferred until the relevant I.C.(48) papers were available. The subject dealt with in Professor Bonnet's Proposition 10 was closely connected with the general problem raised by Article 19 and he (the Acting President) suggested therefore that the subject raised by Professor Bonnet in this Proposition should be referred to the general study of Article 19 which, when considering Paper I.C.(48)11, the Commission had agreed should be undertaken by the Secretary to the Commission before the next meeting of the Congress. The Acting President suggested that the consideration of the remaining Propositions submitted by Professor Bonnet (namely Propositions 8 and 15–17) should be deferred until after the close of the present Congress.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

as regards the 17 propositions submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet :—

(a) that, in view of the decisions already taken, no further action was called for as regards the propositions numbered 4 to 7 and 14 and the first and third parts of the proposition numbered 12 ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 15)

(b) that, having regard to the close connection between the subject dealt with in the proposition numbered 10 and the general problem raised by Article 19, the question raised in that proposition should be included among the questions to be studied in the examination of Article 19 which it had been agreed at the meeting noted in the margin should be undertaken by the Secretary to the Commission with a view to the consideration of the whole matter during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress;

(c) that the propositions numbered 1 to 3, 9, 11 and 13, together with the second part of the proposition numbered 12, should be considered at later meetings during the present Session in the manner proposed by the Acting President;

(d) that the consideration of the propositions numbered 8 and 15 to 17 should be deferred until after the close of the present Session of meetings.

Article 18 (nomenclature of hybrids): drafting amendments

(*Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 5)

13. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N. (S.) 21) for the insertion of certain drafting amendments in the provisions of Article 18, relating to the nomenclature of hybrids submitted by Dr. Hans Bytinsky-Salz (Rovigno d'Istria), together with a note thereon submitted by the Secretary in Point (24) of Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

It was explained that the sole object of this proposal was to eliminate certain drafting defects in the existing text of Article 18 of the *Règles*. This proposal which had been published in 1933 (*Int. Ent. Z.* **27**: 153–162) had been received by the Commission later in the same year. It was unfortunate that they had not found it possible to deal with this application at their meeting held in Lisbon in 1935. It should be made clear also that a specific name given under Article 18(d) was subject to all the provisions governing specific names.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

that Article 18 of the *Règles* should be amended in the manner indicated below:—

(a) *Section* (*a*), *at end add:*—"In the case of a hybrid between two species belonging to the same genus, the trivial names of the two parents united by the sign of multiplication may be placed in round brackets (parentheses) and cited immediately after the name of the common genus. Example: *Tetrao* (*tetrix* x *urogallus*)."

(b) *Section* (*b*), *at end:*—Substitute the words "who first published a description of the hybrid as such" for the words "who first recognised the hybrid form as such";

(c) *Section* (*c*), *after the example at present cited:* add the words :—

“ or $\dfrac{\textit{Tetrao tetrix}}{\textit{Tetrao urogallus}}$ x *Gallus gallus* ”

(d) *Section* (*d*), *at the beginning* :—Substitute the words “ When the identity of either of the parents of a hybrid is not incontestably established both as to species and sex ” for the words “ when the parents of a hybrid are not known as such ” and after the words “ specific name ” add the words : “ a name so given being subject to all the provisions governing specific names.”

Names published either anonymously or over initials only : status under the Law of Priority

14. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the status of names (generic and trivial) published either anonymously or over initials only (file Z.N. (S.) 84) and in this connection had before them a note submitted by the Secretary in Point (25) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

It was clearly most undesirable that new names should be published either anonymously or over initials only, for the publication of a name in this way made it difficult for later authors clearly to cite that name. On the other hand there was nothing in the existing text of Article 25 (Law of Priority) to suggest, still less to prescribe, that a name published in this way forfeited the rights which it would otherwise have possessed under the Law of Priority. It was suggested that Article 25 should be amended to secure that in future a name so published should have no rights under the Law of Priority until such later date as it was republished by an author whose name was stated in the paper in which the name was so re-published. It was felt, however, that it would not be practicable or desirable to give retroactive effect to this provision, for in the older literature there was a number of important books which had been published anonymously. One example of such a book was the celebrated work on the Lepidoptera of Europe, commonly known as the “ Vienna Catalogue ” which was published anonymously in 1775 by (as was now known) the two Viennese priests Schiffermüller and Denis. If this book were to be ruled out for the purposes of the Law of Priority, numerous well-known names would cease to be available, the type localities of many other species would have to be changed and great confusion would ensue. It was accordingly proposed that the new provision ruling out for availability names until they had been published in a work, in which the author's name was given should come into effect as from the same future date as that selected as the date on which other new provisions now proposed to be inserted in the *Règles* should become operative.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that Article 25 should be amended in such a way as to make it clear :—

  (a) that, when, *prior to midnight Greenwich Mean Time, 31st December 1950/1st January* 1951, a name belonging to a category, to which Article 25 applies, is published anonymously, over a pseudonym or over initials only, that name, notwithstanding its having been so published, is to be accepted as having availability under Article 25, provided that its manner of publication satisfies the requirements specified in that Article ;

  (b) that, when, *subsequent to the point of time specified in* (a) *above*, a name belonging to a category, to which Article 25 applies, is published anonymously, over a pseudonym or over initials only, that name is to have no availability under Article 25 until such later date as it is re-published by the same or some other author in a book or paper in which that author's name is given ;

  (c) that the fact of re-publication by a named author shall be sufficient to confer availability upon the name in question for the purposes of Article 25, provided either :—

    (i) that the author by whom the name is republished complies, when so doing, with the requirements specified in Provisos (b) and (c) to Article 25, or

    (ii) in cases where the foregoing requirements had been duly complied with in the earlier book or paper in which the name had been published anonymously, over a pseudonym or over initials only, that the author by whom the name is republished cites, when so doing, a bibliographical reference to the book or paper in which the name had previously been published anonymously, over a pseudonym or over initials only ;

  (d) that, when a name originally published anonymously, over a pseudonym or over initials acquires availability under Article 25 through being republished in the manner specified in (c) above, that name shall rank for purposes of priority as from the date on which it so acquired such availability and shall be attributed to the author of the book or paper, the publication of which conferred that availability upon the name in question ;

(2) that a *Recommandation* should be inserted in the portion of Article 25 containing the provisions specified in (1) above, recommending authors, when citing a book or paper which was published anonymously, over a pseudonym or over initials only, but the author of which is known from other sources or when citing the name of a taxonomic unit published in such a book or paper prior to the date specified in (1)(a) above, to place square brackets round the name of the author of the book or paper concerned or, as the case may be, round the name of the author of the taxonomic unit cited, in order to indicate that the work or name concerned had originally been published anonymously, over a pseudonym or over initials only ;

(3) that a *Recommandation* should be added to the portion of Article 25 containing the provisions specified in (1) above recommending that every author, on validating a name previously published anonymously, over a pseudonym or over initials only by republishing that name in the manner specified in (1) above, should make it clear in the book or paper concerned that he is conferring availability upon the name in question and should notify the fact that availability under Article 25 has been so conferred upon the name in question to a literature-recording serial such as the " Zoological Record " as soon as possible after the publication of the book or paper concerned, either by sending to that serial a marked copy of that book or paper or otherwise, so that the fact that the name in question has acquired availability under Article 25 may be recorded in the next issue of that serial ;

(4) that the provisions in (1) to (3) above should apply, *mutatis mutandis* to names formed under Article 4.

Article 25 (meaning of the expression " divulgué dans une publication ")

15. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a historical account of the deliberations of the Commission since 1910 on the question of the meaning to be attached to the expression " divulgué dans une publication " as used in Article 25, submitted by the Secretary to the Commission.

together with proposals for action, in Point (26) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

The lack of an authoritative definition of what constitutes publication for the purposes of zoological nomenclature was a constant source of difficulty for zoologists, and the failure of the Commission adequately to grapple with this problem had led to much well-merited criticism. A start had been made in 1910 (in *Opinion* 15) and the matter had been carried a little further two years later when in 1912 *Opinion* 51 had been published. Nothing more was done in this matter until some years after the close of the war of 1914–18. In the late twenties, however, the subject was extensively discussed between the members of the Commission and in 1930 this subject (which by then had been given the reference number " 1930H ") was the subject of a tentative proposal which had shortly before been published by Dr. C. W. Stiles, then Secretary to the Commission (*Trans. IV int. Congr. Entom.* : 628–629). Though brought before the Commission at their meeting held in Padua in 1930, this matter was not discussed at that meeting. It was not even placed on the Agenda for the Lisbon meeting in 1935. Although the proposal put forward in 1930 had been shelved at that time, the proposal itself raised a number of valuable points to which careful consideration had been given during the recent re-examination of this subject. The correspondence which had led up to that proposal (file Z.N.(S.)84), though incomplete, had also proved of great interest.

The proposition laid down in 1910 (in *Opinion* 15) was that : " Publication, in the sense of the Code, consists in the public issue of printed matter." In 1912 (in *Opinion* 51) the Commission had re-stated the proposition enunciated two years earlier and had added : " The qualifying word ' public ' in this definition indicates that the printed matter in question is not intended for special persons only or for a limited time, but that it is given to the world, or used in the nature of a permanent record." In the 36 years which had elapsed since the publication of the more recent of these *Opinions*, a development had occurred which had not been anticipated by the Commission, namely the publication—if it could properly be called " publication "—of new names in books and papers reproduced by some method (e.g. photographic and lithographic processes of various kinds, mimeographing and similar systems) other than printing. Some of these methods were extremely unsatisfactory but others attained a high degree of technical excellence. It would be unreasonable to accept new names appearing in papers reproduced by methods falling in the first of these classes, but it would be equally unreasonable to reject new names appearing in papers reproduced by methods falling in the second of these classes, some of the methods of reproduction being fully as good as printing, the finished paper being indeed better than some papers reproduced by actual printing. The preliminary definitions given in 1910 and 1912 needed, therefore, to be reviewed from this point of view.

The proposals now submitted had been the subject of extensive consultations with specialists, both by correspondence and by personal discussion notably during the visit paid by the Secretary to the United States and Canada at the end of 1947. These consultations had led to certain modifications of the proposals previously considered. For example, it was evident that it would not be appropriate to require that, in order for a paper to qualify as having been " published," at least some copies must have been placed on sale, for it had then been ascertained that certain University institutions in the United States distributed the whole edition of their publications free of charge, no copies being placed on sale. It would clearly be wrong so to define " publication " as to render invalid, because not " published," new names appearing in papers which had been " divulgués " in this way.

Finally, the whole subject had been carefully reviewed in order to exclude provisions of a " ritualistic " character, that is to say technical provisions, the non-compliance with which would have the effect of invalidating names. With this object in view, the proposals had been drawn up in two groups : (1) mandatory provisions specifying the minimum standard which must be complied with in order to enable a book or paper to qualify as having been published and therefore to ensure that a new name which appeared therein had been duly " divulgué dans une publication " ; (2) non-mandatory provisions to be inserted in Article 25 as *Recommandations* setting out the ideal standard to be aimed at.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to recommend :—

(a) that, either in Article 25 or at some other appropriate point in the *Règles*, there should be inserted provisions prescribing :—

(i) that a name made public, *prior to midnight G.M.T. (Greenwich Mean Time), 31st December,* 1950/1*st January,* 1951, is to be deemed to have been made public in a publication ("divulgué dans une publication") only if the document containing the name satisfies both of the following conditions :—

(α) it must have been reproduced either by printing or by some other mechanical method of reproduction which secures that every copy is identical with every other copy ;

(β) it must be a document issued for purposes of record and therefore of consultation by interested persons and must accordingly not be a document issued for exclusive consideration by special persons only, or only for particular purposes or for a limited time ;

(ii) that a name made public, *subsequent to the point of time specified in* (i) *above*, is to be deemed to have been made public in a publication ("divulgué dans une publication"), only if the document containing the name satisfies all of the following conditions :—

(α) it must have been made public in conditions which satisfy the requirements both of section (α) and of section (β) of (i) above ;

(β) it must be reproduced on paper, and with ink, of quality and durability sufficient to offer a reasonable prospect of permanency ;

(γ) where the document containing the name is distributed by, or on behalf of, its author to certain selected persons, at least some copies must also be placed on sale or made available for issue free of charge to any institution or person who may apply for a copy ;

(iii) that, where there is any reasonable doubt as to whether a given book or paper has been made public in conditions which satisfy the requirements of section (i) or section (ii) above, as the case may be, and therefore as to whether new names contained therein have been made public in a publication (" divulgué dans une publication "), the question should be referred forthwith to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision ;

(b) that, associated with the provisions specified in (a) above, provisions should be inserted in the *Règles* making it clear that a new name is not to be deemed to have been made public in a publication (" divulgué dans une publication ") if the only action or actions to make that name public consists of :—

- (i) the deposit of the paper containing the new name in a public library or in the library of a scientific institution, however that document may have been reproduced ;
- (ii) the mention of the new name in a paper presented orally before a meeting of any kind ;
- (iii) the affixing of the new name on the label attached to a museum specimen;

(c) that the provisions specified in (b) above should be linked with the undermentioned provisions which it had already been agreed at the present Session should be inserted in the *Règles*, namely the provisions relating to the status of a new name when the only action taken to make that name public consists of :—

- (i) the distribution of printer's proof sheets of the book or paper containing the new name (Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 19(a)) ;
- (ii) the distribution of *separata* in advance of the appearance of the paper in question in the book or serial, for inclusion in which it was printed (Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 19(b)) ;

(iii) the introduction of the new name in a note in explanation of a photograph or other illustration, where that note and accompanying photograph or other illustration is merely distributed by the author to colleagues or students or inserted by him in separates of a paper which did not itself contain the new name accompanied by an indication (Paris Session 6th Meeting, Conclusion 19(c)) ;

(iv) the inclusion of the new name in a book or paper published anonymously or over a pseudonym or initials only, where that book or paper is published subsequent to midnight (G.M.T.), 31st December, 1950/1st January, 1951 (Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion 14(1)(b)) ;

(d) that there should be added to the provisions specified in (a) above a *Recommandation*, urging institutions and individuals responsible for the publication of books and papers affecting the status of names to secure that there appears in the book or, as the case may be, the part of the book or serial affecting, or comprising papers affecting, such names, a clear statement specifying :—

(i) the name of the institution, firm or individual responsible for publishing the book or serial concerned ;

(ii) the address from which the book or serial concerned may be purchased or, where the book or serial is not placed on sale, the address from which a free copy may be obtained ;

(iii) the price for which a copy may be purchased, in those cases where the book or serial is placed on sale ;

(e) that there should be added to the provisions specified in (a) above a *Recommandation* urging institutions, authors and other persons responsible for the publication of books and serials on zoological or palaeontological subjects to avoid publishing anything affecting the status of names in books or serials reproduced by any method other than printing;

(f) that there should be added to the provisions specified in (a) above a *Recommandation* urging authors not to publish in the non-scientific press zoological or palaeontological papers containing new names;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 3(3) (a) (ii))

(g) that the first sentence (relating to the languages recommended as the only languages to be used for describing new systematic units) of Section "A" of the *Appendice* to the *Règles* (in future to be known, in accordance with the decision noted in margin, as the "Second Schedule" to the *Règles*) should be deleted and that, in order to give greater prominence to this important question, there should be added to Article 25 a *Recommandation* urging that in every book or paper containing the name of a new genus, subgenus, species, subspecies or infra-subspecific form or a new name for any unit belonging to any of the foregoing categories, the existing name of which requires to be replaced under the Law of Homonymy, the description, definition or indication published for the unit to which the new name is given should be published in one or other of the five following languages, namely, German, English, French, Italian or Latin, in addition to the language in which the book or paper is written, when that language is not one of the five languages specified above;

(2) to repeal *Opinions* 15 and 51 for interpretative purposes.

Names of new taxonomic units published in abstracts in advance of the paper or of the portion of the paper containing the description of the new unit: status of

16. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a communication submitted by Dr. Waldo L. Schmitt (Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.) regarding the status of names published in abstracts in advance of the paper containing the description of the new taxonomic unit concerned (file Z.N.(S.)262), together with a proposal on this subject submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in Point (27) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

Formerly, new names had often been published by learned societies in abstracts printed and distributed before the meeting at which the paper containing the new names was to be presented. This practice had led to difficulties, for it had often involved the publication either of *nomina nuda* or of names of genera and species so inadequately characterised that it was a matter of doubt and dispute whether the name had been published with an indication, within the meaning of Article 25 of the *Règles*. It had, moreover, often been a matter of difficulty to determine whether a new name made public in this way had been " divulgué dans une publication " within the meaning of Article 25 and therefore whether it possessed any availability under the Law of Priority. This method of publishing new names was open to strong objection and should be discouraged. Similar objections applied to the publication of a new name in an abstract or summary at the head of a paper and to the publication of a new name in the introductory portion of a paper in advance of the description of the new taxonomic unit concerned.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that a *Recommandation* should be added to Article 25 of the *Règles*, urging institutions and individuals responsible for the publication of books or papers containing new names to refrain from publishing those names for the first time either (1) in abstracts issued in advance of the publication of the book or paper containing the description of the taxonomic unit so named or (2) in abstracts placed at the head of the book or paper containing the description of the new taxonomic unit or in the introductory portions of the book or paper concerned in advance of the actual description of the new taxonomic unit.

Generic and trivial names first published in keys : status of

17. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a communication submitted by Dr. Waldo L. Schmitt (Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.) regarding the status of generic and trivial names first published in keys (file Z.N.(S.)262), together with a proposal on this subject submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in Point (28) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

It would clearly be wrong to refuse to accept names of new genera or species when those names were first published in keys. Nevertheless, this method of publishing new names was open to objection, for this method of publication made it difficult, and, in the case of trivial names, virtually impossible, properly to comply with the requirements of Article 25 of the *Règles*. It was desirable therefore that this method of publishing new names should be discouraged.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that a *Recommandation* should be added to Article 25 urging authors not to publish new names for the first time in keys, or, if it were desired to publish such names in a book or paper which contained, or consisted primarily of, a key, to publish those names with accompanying descriptions at the beginning of the book or paper concerned and in advance of the key.

Article 25 (criteria to be adopted in determining the date of publication of a given book or paper)

18. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a note on the question of the criteria to be adopted in determining the date of publication of a given book or paper, submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in Point (29) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

(*Previous reference, Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 15)

It was explained that the question of the meaning of the expression " date of publication " and the criteria to be adopted for determining, for any given book or paper, what was the date of its publication, had received some consideration from the Commission when, during the inter-war years, they had examined the cognate problem of the criteria to be adopted for determining whether or not a given book or paper had been published at all and therefore whether new names appearing therein had been duly made public in a publication (" divulgué dans une publication ") for the purposes of Article 25 (file Z.N.(S.)84). No effective progress had, however, been made in this matter and zoologists had been left without any guidance as to the line which they should follow when it was impossible to determine with certainty the relative dates either of two names, each applying to the same unit, or of the same name applied to different taxonomic units. The object of the present proposals was to fill this gap by inserting in the *Règles* simple rules which followed the general lines of the unofficial practice of zoologists in this matter.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

the insertion in or near Article 25 of the following provisions :—

(a) the date on which copies of a work (the expression " work " for the purpose of the present provision and of provisions (b) and (c) below, to include any independent work or serial publication or, in either case, a volume or part thereof) produced in conditions which constitute publication are mailed to subscribers or are placed on sale or, where the whole edition is distributed free of charge, are mailed to institutions and individuals to whom such free copies are normally distributed, is to be taken to be the date of publication of that work.

(b) where a work bears a date purporting to specify or to indicate the date of publication, that date is to be deemed to be correct, unless and until evidence is published showing that date to be incorrect, in which case the work or any specified portion thereof is to be deemed to have been published on the latest date (whether earlier or later than the date specified or indicated in the work itself) that is compatible with the evidence so adduced ;

(c) where there is no evidence to suggest that the date specified or indicated in a given work is incorrect, the date as on which that work is to be deemed to have been published is to be determined in accordance with the following rules :—

(i) a work which bears a statement of the year, month and day of publication is to be deemed to have been published on the date so specified ;

(ii) a work which bears a statement of the year and month, but not of the day of publication is to be deemed to have been published on the last day of the month so specified, save where evidence is published showing that publication took place during the month in question on some day prior to the last day, in which case the work in question is to be deemed to have been published on the latest day compatible with the evidence so adduced ;

(iii) a work which bears a statement of the year but not of the month and day of publication is to be deemed to have been published on the last day of the last month of that year, save where evidence is published showing that publication of the whole or of some portion or portions of the work concerned took place during the year in question but prior to the last day thereof, in which case the work or the portion or portions concerned is, or are, to be deemed to have been published on the latest date compatible with the evidence so adduced, any portion of such a work in respect of which no such supplementary evidence regarding the date of publication is forthcoming is to be deemed, as provided above, to have been published on the last day of the last month of the year concerned ;

(iv) a work which contains no evidence regarding the date on which it was published, except a range of years, specified on the title page or elsewhere, is to be deemed to have been published on the last day of the last month of the later, or, as the case may be, the latest of the years so specified, save that, where evidence is published showing that a portion, or that portions, of that work, was, or, as the case may be, were, published prior to the date specified above, each portion concerned is to be deemed to have been published on the latest date compatible with the evidence so adduced, any portion of the work in respect of which no such supplementary evidence regarding the date of publication is forthcoming to be deemed, as provided above, to have been published on the last day of the last month of the later, or, as the case may be, the latest of the years specified in the range of years given in work concerned ;

(d) where a work contains no direct evidence regarding the date on which it, or any portion of it, was published, the date of publication is to be determined by reference to such evidence as may be available from other sources, including evidence afforded by the date of publication of the first published book or serial publication or portion thereof containing a reference to the work in question or any portion thereof, the date to be adopted as the date of publication to be the latest date compatible with such evidence.

Date of publication of a name: method of citation recommended

19. THE COMMISSION turned next to consider the proposals for the insertion in the *Règles* of *Recommandations* regarding the method of notation to be adopted by authors when citing the date of publication of a given name, for the purpose of distinguishing between (1) a date expressly specified in the volume in which the name concerned was first published, (2) a date ascertained from indirect evidence obtained from an examination of the volume in question, and (3) a date ascertained solely by reference to external sources (file Z.N.(S.)84). In this connection, the Commission had before them certain proposals submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in the second portion of Point (29) of Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

It was pointed out in discussion that care would be needed in the choice of the wording to be used in the *Règles* to give effect to the present proposals, owing to the fact that the expression " bracket " was used in different senses in England and America, in the former country this expression having the meaning of a sign, either semilunar or square, used to divide off certain words in a sentence from other parts of the sentence, the word " bracket " being qualified by the adjective " round " or "square " according to the form of the sign used, whereas in America only the square sign (called a " square bracket " in England) was denoted by the expression " bracket," the semilunar form being denoted by the expression " parenthesis."

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should be added to the mandatory provisions recommended in Conclusion 18 above a *Recommandation* urging authors when citing the date of publication of a name :—

(a) to refrain from placing either semilunar signs (i.e. parentheses or round brackets) or square signs (i.e. square brackets) round the date of publication of a name, if that date is given on the title page of the volume containing the name or in an express statement regarding the date of publication of the volume or of the parts in which that volume was published, where such a statement is included in the volume itself ;

(b) to enclose within semilunar signs (i.e. parentheses or round brackets) the date of publication of a name or a part of that date (e.g. the month of publication), where that date or that part of that date cannot be ascertained directly in the manner specified in (a) above, but can be ascertained indirectly by reference to other evidence afforded by the volume in which the name was originally published, e.g. evidence afforded by dates either printed on the first pages of individual signatures or on the wrappers (covers) in which successive portions of the volume were published ;

(c) to enclose within square signs (i.e. square brackets) the date of publication of a name or a part of such a date (e.g. the month of publication), where that date or that part of a date cannot be ascertained either directly or indirectly in the manner specified respectively in (a) and (b) above and can be determined only by reference to external sources of evidence.

Article 25 (priority to be accorded to a name published in a work issued in instalments where that name is published on one date and the relevant description or part of it at a later date)

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion* 12)

20. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the question of the priority to be accorded to names published in books or journals issued in instalments, in those cases where a new name appears in one instalment and the description of the taxonomic unit so named or a part of that description appears in a later instalment (file Z.N.(S.)352). In this connection, the Commission had before them a proposal submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in Point (30) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

No difficulty arose where a name was published without any description, definition or indication in the portion of the text of a book issued in one instalment, the whole of the description, definition or indication being published in a later instalment, for in that case the name, as published in the earlier instalment, was a *nomen nudum*. Clearly in such a case the name in question could rank for purposes of priority only from the date of publication of the later instalment containing the description, definition or indication of the taxonomic unit to which the new name was applied. There was, however, a real difficulty in those cases where a new name appeared in one instalment of a work and that instalment contained part only of the description, definition or indication, the remaining part appearing on the first page of the next instalment. In such cases the criterion to be applied should be whether the descriptive matter given in the first instalment was sufficient to afford an indication for the purposes of Article 25 of the *Règles.* The question was of some importance, for owing to the interval which sometimes occurred between the publication of successive parts of a given work, cases might arise where the relative priority of two names for (say) the same species or subspecies might turn on the answer to be given to the foregoing question.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that there should be added to Article 25 a provision that, where a new taxonomic unit to which that Article applies is described in a book or serial which is published in parts and the name of the taxonomic unit is published in one instalment and the description, definition or indication relating to the taxonomic unit so named is published partly in the instalment in which the name is published and partly in the next succeeding instalment, the name is to rank for purposes of the Law of Priority as from the date of publication of the later published of the parts concerned, except where the portion of the description, definition or indication contained in the earlier published part is sufficient to comply with the requirements of Article 25 ;

(2) that there should be added to the mandatory provision recommended in (1) above a *Recommandation* urging institutions and individuals responsible for the publication of books or serials containing new names to ensure that, where a book or serial is published in parts, the description of a new taxonomic unit, belonging to a category to the names of which Article 25 applies, is not cut into two portions, the first portion being published at the end of one instalment and the remainder at the beginning of the next succeeding instalment.

Article 25 (status of a trivial name published in conjunction with a generic name which does not comply with the requirements of Proviso (c))

21. THE COMMISSION had under consideration communications in regard to the status of a trivial name published subsequent to 31st December, 1930, in cases where the generic name used in conjunction with the trivial name in question is invalid by reason of its not satisfying the requirements of Proviso (c) to Article 25 received (a) from President Karl Jordan and (b) from specialists in the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. (file Z.N.(S.)315), together with a note on the same subject submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in Point (31) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

In view of the fact that doubts had been raised as to the correct interpretation of Article 25 in relation to trivial names published in the manner described above, it was clearly desirable that words should be inserted in Article 25 to make the position absolutely clear. As regards the nature of that action, it would clearly be " ritualistic " in the highest degree to prescribe that a trivial name published in the foregoing circumstances is invalid and possesses no status under the Law of Priority until such later time as it is republished in a binominal combination in which the generic name was a nomenclatorially available name. Moreover, such a decision would have the further serious disadvantage that it would make it necessary to provide also that a trivial name published in a binominal combination in which the generic name was invalid by reason of being a homonym was itself invalid until such later time as it was republished in combination with a generic name which was a nomenclatorially available name.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted in Article 25 to make it clear that the status of a trivial name (specific, subspecific or infra-subspecific) is not adversely affected where the generic name with which it was combined when first published is a name which was itself either an unavailable name by reason of its having been published in conditions which do not satisfy the requirements of Article 25 (Law of Priority) (proviso (c) cases) or was invalid under the Law of Homonymy.

Schedule replacing the former " Appendice " to the " Regles ": proposed addition to, of a section on the transliteration of words from the Cyrillic to the Latin alphabet

22. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)310) that there should be added to the *Appendice* to the *Règles* a section giving particulars as to the manner in which words belonging to languages using the Cyrillic alphabet should be transliterated into the Latin alphabet in cases where words belonging to such languages were selected to form the basis of generic or trivial names and had therefore to be Latinised in accordance with the provisions of Article 3. In this connection, the Commission had before it also a note submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in Point (32) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 3(3)(a) (ii))

It was pointed out that the *Appendice* to the *Règles* (henceforward, as agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, to be a Schedule to the *Règles*) contained a Section prescribing the manner in which words of Greek origin should be transliterated into the Latin alphabet in cases where such words required Latinisation as a preliminary to being used as generic or trivial names, and that it was equally desirable to provide a corresponding Section relating to the transliteration for the same purpose of words belonging to languages using the Cyrillic alphabet. The rules governing the transliteration of such words were known to very few persons not personally acquainted with languages using the Cyrillic alphabet; the growing number of scientific names based upon such words made it increasingly necessary to provide guidance on this subject.

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 3)

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that there should be added to the Schedule which it had been agreed should replace the existing *Appendice* to the *Règles* a Section setting out the manner in which words belonging to languages using the Cyrillic alphabet should be transliterated into the Latin alphabet, for the purpose of forming zoological names in accordance with the provisions of Article 3;

(2) that, consequential upon (1) above, the Section forming Section G to the present *Appendice* should be amended so as to exclude from the scope of the recommendations set forth therein geographical and proper names originating in languages using the Cyrillic or Greek alphabets (for the first of which provision would be made under (1) above, while, for the second, provision had already been made in Section F of the *Appendice*) and to secure that the recommendations set forth in this Section should relate to the proper method of transliteration into the Latin alphabet only of geographical and proper names originating in languages which either used alphabets other than those specified above or which had no recognised alphabet.

Eighth Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session: date and time noted

(Previous reference: Paris Session: 6th Meeting, Conclusion 77)

23. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) proposed that, now that the examination of Commission Paper I.C.(48)14 had been completed, the Commission should adjourn for the day. As already arranged, the next meeting of the Commission, which would be held concurrently with the First Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature, would take place on the morning of the following day (Friday, 23rd July, 1948) at 0900 hours.

THE COMMISSION took note of the above arrangements.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned at* 2250 *hours*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology,
Paris, 21*st*–27*th July*, 1948

CONCLUSIONS of the Eighth Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Friday, 23rd July, 1948, at 0900 hours

(*Meeting held concurrently with the First Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature*)

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
Professor E. Beltrán (Mexico)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor R. Spärck (Denmark)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present :

M. H. Berthet (France)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
M. André Chavan (France)
Mr. J. Delacour (U.S.A.)
Mr. C. F. dos Passos (U.S.A.)
Professor E. Raymond Hall (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*
Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer*

Procedure proposed to be adopted at the present (eighth) Meeting

1. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present meeting of the Commission was a public meeting held concurrently with the first meeting of the Section on Nomenclature. All the matters which would be brought forward would be of interest to the Commission as a body, and he proposed therefore that the Commission should remain in continuous session throughout the meeting. He (the Acting President) anticipated that matters might be brought before the Section during the joint meeting on which the Commission might feel that, if they were given the necessary opportunity, they would be able to reach an immediate decision which could then be reported back to the Section forthwith. If the discussion were to develop in this way, it was his intention, in his capacity as President of the Section, to invite the Section formally to adjourn to enable the Commission to consider matters so brought forward. Those members of the Section who were not members also of the Commission would remain in their places during any such adjournment and would be free, as at the previous public meetings of the Commission, to take part in the discussion of the Commission to such extent as they might desire.

THE COMMISSION :—

took note of, and approved, the procedure proposed by the Acting President.

Emendation to *Psolos* of the spelling of the generic name *Psodos* Treitschke, 1827 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera): M. H. Berthet's proposal

2. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by M. H. Berthet (Paris, France) that they should render an *Opinion* declaring that under Article 19 of the *Règles* the spelling of the generic name *Psodos* Treitschke, 1827 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) should be emended to *Psolos* (file Z.N.(S.)362).[2]

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to render an *Opinion* stating that the spelling *Psoidos* Treitschke, 1825, and the spelling *Psodos* Treitschke, 1827 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) were erroneous and should be emended to *Psolos* under the provisions of Article 19 of the *Règles*.

(2) to place the name *Psolos* (emend. of *Psoidos* and *Psodos*) Treitschke, 1825 *in* Ochsenheimer, *Schmett. Europa* **5** (Abth. 2) : 434 (type species : *Phalaena equestrata* Fabricius, 1777, *Gen. Ins.* : 288) (type species selected by Duponchel, 1829, *in* Godart, *Hist. nat. Lépid. France* **7**(2) : 112) on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology."

Extension, and incorporation in the " Règles ", of the provisions relating to the Commission's plenary powers : Dr. H. Lemche's proposal

3. THE COMMISSION, jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, had under consideration a communication (file Z.N.(S.)359) submitted by Dr. Henning Lemche (Copenhagen, Denmark) on behalf not only of himself but also of a large group of Scandinavian zoologists, in which the applicants asked that there should be inserted in the *Règles* a provision embodying, and at the same time expanding the scope of, the provisions of the Resolution adopted by the Ninth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Monaco in 1913, under which plenary powers to suspend the provisions of the *Règles* in certain cases were conferred upon the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.[3]

---

[2] For the text of the communication made by M. Berthet, see page 157 of Volume 3 of this journal, and for the record of the discussion in the Section on Nomenclature, see pages 3–5 of Volume 5.

(See Section on Nomenclature Paris Session 1st Meeting, Minute 3)

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion 7)

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusions 1-6, 8)

A long discussion (which is fully reported in the Minutes of the Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature) then ensued, in the course of which the ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING), in his capacity as President of the Section, submitted for approval the more modest proposals for dealing with the problem of the plenary powers which the Commission had agreed to submit when they had had Commission Paper I.C.(48)5 under consideration, together with the proposals of the Commission for the reform of the composition of the Commission (based upon the proposals in Commission Paper I.C.(48)3) and for the introduction of improvements in the procedure of the Commission when dealing with applications submitted to it for decision (based on the proposals submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)4. At the conclusion of this discussion, Mr. LEMCHE (Denmark) intimated that, while the proposals submitted by the Commission for the reform of the plenary powers procedure did not go as far as he and his colleagues had advocated, he recognised that the reformed procedure was a great improvement on that laid down in 1913. The Section on Nomenclature thereon unanimously approved the recommendations submitted by the Commission :—

THE COMMISSION took note :—

> that, in view of the outcome of the discussion in the Section on Nomenclature on the proposal for the extension of the plenary powers submitted by Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark), no action was called for on the part of the Commission.

Incorporation in the " Regles " of a provision establishing a Law of Prescription limiting the scope of the Law of Priority : proposals of Dr. H. Lemche and Professor P. Bonnet

4. THE COMMISSION, jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, had under consideration a communication (file Z.N.(S.)359) submitted by Dr. Henning Lemche (Copenhagen, Denmark) on behalf not only of himself but also of a large group of Scandinavian zoologists, in which the applicants asked that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* limiting the Law of Priority, in its application to names published prior to the year 1850 but not used subsequent to that date, by a Law of Prescription which would prevent such names from being substituted for names currently in use.[4] At the same time, the Commission and the Section had under consideration a similar proposal submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France).[5]

---

[3] For the text of the communication made by Dr. Henning Lemche, see pages 158, 159–161 of Volume 3 of this journal, and for the record of the discussion in the Section on Nomenclature, see pages 5–13 of Volume 5.

(See Section on Nomenclature, Paris Session, 1st Meeting, Minute 4)

In the course of a long discussion (which is reported in full in the Minutes of the Section on Nomenclature) it became evident that numerous members of the Section felt strongly that some appropriate means should be found to secure greater stability in nomenclature, even if this meant imposing some restriction upon the scope of the Law of Priority. No member of the Section spoke in favour of the continuance of the present system under which the Law of Priority not only failed to promote uniformity but was itself actively instrumental in leading to confusion and instability in nomenclature.

As regards the particular proposals under consideration, it was suggested by ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER N. D. RILEY (United Kingdom) that the Commission should be asked to consider, and report to the next Congress on, means to be adopted for banning the upsetting of well-known names through the digging-up of old names and the unearthing of old books containing forgotten names. The Acting President (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING), in his capacity as President of the Section on Nomenclature, supported the proposal made by Alternate Commissioner Riley. The subject before the Commission and the Section, was, he pointed out, one of outstanding importance to all systematic workers. It was essential therefore to ensure that full account was taken of all relevant considerations and also of all points of view. All those present at the meeting were in favour of action being taken to limit the harm which, as it seemed to them, resulted from the unfettered operation of the Law of Priority in its present form, but, as a communication which he had received from certain specialists at the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, clearly showed, there were others who pinned their hopes of ultimate uniformity in nomenclature upon that Law alone and who in consequence desired to strengthen that Law at the expense of the Commission's plenary powers.

Mr. JEAN DELACOUR (U.S.A.) said that the proposal to postpone a decision on this important matter could only be made acceptable if at the same time it were agreed that a *Recommandation* should at once be inserted in the *Règles* urging authors not to cause further instability in nomenclature by upsetting well-known names in favour of long-forgotten names but instead at once to report to the Commission any case where the Law of Priority appeared to require the upsetting of a name in this way and to maintain in use the currently accepted name until such time as the Commission had decided whether the Law of Priority should be permitted to operate in the case in question.

---

[4] For the text of the communication made by Dr. Henning Lemche, see pages 159–161 of Volume 3 of this journal, and for the record of the discussion in the Section on Nomenclature, see pages 13–19 of Volume 5.

[5] For the text of Professor Bonnet's paper, see pages 177–179 of Volume 3.

Considerable further discussion took place, in which the importance of devising a satisfactory solution of the difficulties caused by the unfettered operation of the Law of Priority was stressed and, in some cases, regret was expressed at the prospect of a further period of four or five years during which no remedy would be available for countering the present ills. The view was expressed that the proposed *Recommandation* should single out for special mention as names requiring particular consideration names of importance in medicine, agriculture and other fields of applied biology.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to take note of the applications submitted (i) by Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) and (ii) by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) in favour of the incorporation in the *Règles* of a provision recognising a Law of Prescription which would prohibit the replacement, on grounds of priority, of well-known names by names published long previously and not subsequently used for a long period ;

(2) to invite the Secretary to the Commission to examine, in consultation with interested specialists, all means which might secure greater stability in zoological nomenclature and to submit a Report thereon, with recommendations, for consideration by the Commission at their meeting to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress, with a view to the submission by the Commission of proposals for the insertion in the *Règles* of provisions to secure the end specified above ;

(3) to recommend, without prejudice to the proposal to be submitted to the next meeting of th Congress in the report referred to in (2) above, that there should at once be inserted at an appropriate point in the *Règles* a provision :—

    (a) that, where a worker discovers that a well-known name in common use, particularly a name of importance in medicine, agriculture, veterinary science or other applied fields of biology, is invalid under either the Law of Priority or the Law of Homonymy or, in the case of a generic name, has as its type species a species not commonly accepted as referable to the genus in question or to a segregate thereof, that worker should at once report the case to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for such action as the Commission may deem to be proper;

(b) that in such cases neither the worker by whom the error in accepted practice is discovered nor any other worker should change that practice by substituting some other name for that in common use, until such time as the decision on the future status of the name in question is made known by the said Commission.

Nomenclature of Protozoan and other parasites of Man: need for stabilisation: Prof. E. Beltran's communication

5. THE COMMISSION, jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, had under consideration a communication (file Z.N.(S.)397) submitted by Alternate Commissioner Enrique Beltrán (Mexico) on the subject of the nomenclature of Protozoan parasites of Man.[6]

(See Section on Nomenclature, Paris Session, 1st Meeting, Minute 5)

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER BELTRÁN pointed out that at the present time many of the Protozoan parasites of Man were known to bacteriologists by names which possessed only a *de facto* basis and were not in accordance with the provisions of the *Règles*. The situation so created was extremely unsatisfactory and should be rectified as quickly as possible. Alternate Commissioner Beltrán suggested the appointment of a committee of protozoologists charged with the duty of studying the nomenclature of Protozoa, particularly species parasitic on Man, with a view to the submission of recommendations to the Commission for the addition to the "Official List" of the names of genera, in those cases where it was found that the names in question were available under the *Règles* for use in the sense in which they were commonly employed, and in the case of names not found to be so available for validation by the Commission with a view to their being also placed on the "Official List."

In the course of his presentation of the foregoing problem, Alternate Commissioner Beltrán alluded to the need for the Commission to exclude taxonomic considerations when deciding whether to include generic names on the "Official

---

[6] For the text of the communication made by Alternate Commissioner Beltrán, see pages 162–163 of Volume 3 of this journal, and for the record of the discussion in the Section on Nomenclature, see pages 19–23 of Volume 5.

List." He therefore welcomed the action taken by the Commission in *Opinion* 104, when dealing with the names of the human malaria parasites, in avoiding any attempt to express an opinion on the question whether two genera or one genus only were involved. The Commission had, in his view, acted with wisdom on that occasion in placing on the "Official List" two generic names (*Plasmodiam* and *Laverania*) for use for these parasites, the first by those specialists who regarded the quartan and aestivo-autumnal parasites as congeneric and by all specialists for the first of these parasites, the second for use for the aestivo-autumnal parasite by those specialists who regarded it as generically distinct from the quartan parasite.

In the subsequent discussion general agreement was expressed with the proposal submitted by Alternate Commissioner Beltrán that a special effort should be made to stabilise the names of parasites of importance in human medicine. It was felt that it was indefensible that the Laws of Priority and Homonymy, in which only systematic zoologists were interested, should be allowed to cause confusion and disturbance in the nomenclature of such species. On the other hand, it was most undesirable that the present situation, in which many such species were habitually known by names which were incorrect under the *Règles*, should be permitted to continue. For names of the kind under consideration there was a clear *prima facie* case for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers. The view was expressed also that the problem raised by Alternate Commissioner Beltrán regarding the nomenclature of parasites of Man was by no means confined to Protozoa; that there were numerous similar instances in Phyla other than Protozoa. It was agreed by all present that the proposals submitted by Alternate Commissioner Beltrán should be expanded to apply to the names of genera containing species parasitic on Man, irrespective of the Phyla to which they belonged.

On the question raised by Alternate Commissioner Beltrán regarding the need for the Commission to avoid taking, or appearing to take, a view on taxonomic issues, when placing generic names on the "Official List," the Commission, in agreement with the Section on Nomenclature, decided that, in future, in order to eliminate taxonomic problems from consideration when names are added to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology," two or more generic names should be placed on that List, in cases where specialists were agreed on the importance of stabilising the nomenclature of a particular group but were not unanimous on the purely taxonomic question of whether more than one genus was involved and that this decision should be embodied in the regulations governing the preparation of the " Official List."

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to take steps, in compliance with the request addressed to them by the Section on Nomenclature, to concert with specialists to secure the appointment of a committee or committees (a) to study the nomenclature of the Phylum Protozoa and other Phyla containing species which were parasites of Man and (b) to make proposals to the Commission for the addition to the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology," whether under their plenary powers or otherwise, of the names of leading genera of such Phyla, particularly genera containing species which were parasites of Man, for the purpose of promoting the stabilisation of the nomenclature of the groups concerned ;

(2) to issue a statement drawing the attention of specialists to the action proposed in (1) above.

" Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " : addition to the regulations relating to, of a provision designed to eliminate taxonomic considerations

6. Arising out of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 5 above, THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to take note that the Section on Nomenclature had decided that there should be added to the regulations governing the preparation of the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " a provision that, in order to eliminate taxonomic considerations when names were added to the said " Official List," two or more generic names should be added thereto, in cases where specialists were agreed on the importance of stabilising the nomenclature of a particular group but were not unanimous on the purely taxonomic question of whether more than one genus was involved.

Ninth and Tenth Meetings of the Commission during its Paris Session : date and time appointed

7. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that it had previously been contemplated that it would be necessary for the Commission to hold two further meetings that day, the first in the afternoon and the second in the evening. Such good progress had been made by the Commission in the consideration of their Agenda that it was now possible for him to propose that there should be no meeting that afternoon, thereby making it possible for such members of the Commission who so desired to take part in the excursion to the Château de Versailles which had been arranged by the authorities of the Congress. This change in plan would make it possible also for him to make progress with the preparation of further documents for the consideration of the Commission. He proposed therefore that the next meeting of the Commission should be held that evening at 2030 hours. As regards the following day there would be a joint meeting with the Section on Nomenclature at 0900 hours.

THE COMMISSION took note of the above arrangements.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned at* 1205 *hours*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 21st–27th July, 1948

CONCLUSIONS of the Ninth Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Friday, 23rd July, 1948, at 2030 hours

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present :

Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
Professor E. Raymond Hall (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*
Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer*

Miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the " Regles " : third instalment

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 6)

1. THE COMMISSION had before them a memorandum by the Secretary (Commission Paper I.C.(48)15), containing a third instalment of miscellaneous proposals received from various sources for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles*. For convenience of reference these proposals, which were 31 in number, had been numbered consecutively with the proposals brought forward in the paper containing the second instalment (Commission Paper I.C.(48)14). The present proposals were therefore numbered (33) to (63).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to examine Commission Paper I.C.(48)15, point by point, for the purpose of reaching conclusions regarding the recommendations to be submitted on the questions raised therein.

Article 27 (proposed insertion of words making it clear that this Article applies, *inter alia*, to the naming of forms of polymorphic species)

2. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by Dr. C. A. Hoare (London) (file Z.N.(S.)291), asking for the addition of words to Article 27 to make it clear that the provisions of that Article applied to polymorphic species, together with a note on the same subject set forth in Point (33) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15. It was not clearly stated in Article 27 that its provisions applied to cases where one form of such a species was named before another in the same way as to different stages in the metamorphosis of a species possessing only a single adult form. Dr. Hoare observed that, while the present wording might be appropriate for the needs of the Metazoa, it did not meet the needs of the Protozoa, where the problem of species possessing both sexual and asexual forms was of special importance.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) observed that Dr. Hoare had drawn attention to what was undoubtedly a technical flaw in Article 27 as that Article at present stood and words should be inserted to make this matter clear. The adoption of an amendment in the sense proposed would not lead to changes in the current nomenclature of the Protozoa, for protozoologists had rightly assumed that the intention, though not the wording, of Article 27 was that its provisions should apply to names given to forms of polymorphic species. This Article had always been so interpreted, for example, in the synonymy of the names given to the human malaria parasites, a subject on which Professor Robert L. Usinger and himself had each made a special study and on which proposals would be laid before the Commission at a later meeting. Though the problem raised by Dr. Hoare was of special importance to protozoologists, it was not a problem confined to the Protozoa, for polymorphism of a very similar kind occurred also in the Class Insecta, where also other forms of polymorphism commonly occurred. It was desirable therefore that the wording to be proposed to meet the point raised by Dr. Hoare should be sufficiently wide to cover all forms of polymorphism in species.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted in Article 27 to make it clear that the provisions of that Article applied to names published for forms of polymorphic species and therefore that, in the case of such species, the oldest available specific or subspecific trivial name applied to any form is to be accepted as the trivial name of the species as a whole.

Article 35 (polymorphism in trivial names arising from use of the same word in noun and adjectival form)

3. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a communication received from Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (San Diego, California, U.S.A.), on the question whether trivial names which differed from one another only by the form of their termination, for example, in the use of the terminations " -costa " and " -costata " (file Z.N.(S.)309) should be regarded as homonyms of one another, together with a note on the same subject contained in the first part of Point (34) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

In his submission on this matter Mr. Baily had taken the view that, as the spelling differences referred to above were not among the differences specified in paragraph (3) of Article 35, names differing from one another only in this way were not to be rejected as homonyms under the *Règles*. At the same time he brought forward two pairs of names of this kind, where, in his opinion, confusion had already arisen through the great similarity of the trivial names concerned. The cases in question were those presented (1) by the names *Cardita crassicosta* Lamarck, 1819, and *Cardita crassicostata* Sowerby, 1825, and (2) *Cardita laticosta* Eichwald, 1830, and *Cardita laticostata* Sowerby, 1832. In each of these cases, Mr. Baily asked that the Commission should use their plenary powers to suppress the later published of the two names in question. In Commission Paper I.C.(48)15, the Secretary to the Commission took the same view as Mr. Baily regarding the interpretation of the *Règles* in this matter but recommended that Article 35 should be amended to make names belonging to this class homonyms of one another.

In the discussion which ensued the view was expressed that no objection need be taken in principle to the concurrent use in the same genus of trivial names differing from one another solely by reason of the fact that in the one case the word concerned was in noun form and could therefore be treated as being a nominative singular in apposition to the generic name, while in the other case the name was in adjectival form and thus required to agree in gender with the generic name. There should normally be no room for confusion in such cases, having regard to the fact that, under the decisions which had been taken during the present Congress, it would now be made absolutely clear that the list of spelling differences specified in paragraph (3) of Article 35 was an exhaustive list and therefore that no name was to be rejected as a homonym of another name which differed from it in spelling in any other way. On the other hand, it was desirable that trivial names within a given genus should be readily distinguishable from one another. Authors should therefore be recommended to avoid selecting as the trivial name of a new species or subspecies a name which differed only in its termination (noun form or adjectival form, as the case might be) from a trivial name already published for a species in the same genus or allied genera. Naturally, the recognition of names of the kind under discussion as available names, notwithstanding their close similarity, would not preclude the Commission from using their plenary powers to suppress such a name where in an individual case it could be shown that the concurrent existence of two such closely similar names had already caused, or was likely to cause, confusion.

THE COMMISSION :—

(*Previous reference : Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 43)

(1) agreed that, having regard to the fact that it had now been decided to make it clear that the list of differences in spelling given in paragraph (3) of Article 35 was an exhaustive list, no action required to be taken in regard to trivial names of the same origin and meaning which differed from one another only by reason of the fact that in one case the name was in a noun form, while in the other it was in an adjectival form (e.g. *crassicosta* and *crassicostatus*, *-a*, *-um*), for it would now be clear that, where such names occurred in a single genus, they were not to be regarded as homonyms of one another ;

(2) agreed to recommend that there should be inserted in the *Règles* a *Recommandation* urging authors not to select a compound word as a new trivial name, where there already existed either in the same genus or in an allied genus a compound trivial name of the same origin and meaning differing therefrom only by reason of the second part of that name consisting of a word in a noun form whereas the corresponding part of the proposed new name consisted of the same word in an adjectival form or *vice versa*. (Example : where in a given genus or group of genera there already exists a trivial name *crassicosta* (noun form), an adjectival trivial name such as *crassicostatus*, *-a*, *-um*, should be avoided, and *vice versa*.) ;

(3) agreed to recommend that, where in any given case it could be shown that the concurrent existence within a single genus or group of allied genera of trivial names differing from one another only in the manner indicated in (1) above has caused, or was likely to cause, confusion, an end should be put to such confusion or, as the case might be, such confusion should be prevented from arising, by the use of the plenary powers ;

(4) agreed that the Secretary should explain the position in this matter to Mr. Baily and should ask him whether in the circumstances he desired to pursue his application in regard to the two pairs of names in the genus *Cardita* Bruguière, 1792 (Phylum Mollusca) which he had already submitted to the Commission (file Z.N.(S.)309).

Articles 34 and 35 (third paragraph) (proposed addition of a further category)

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusions 41 & 43)

4. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by Captain E. Rivenhall Goffe (King's Somborne, England) asking that certain additions should be made to the list of spelling differences specified in paragraph (3) of Article 35 (file Z.N.(S.)198), together with a proposal in regard thereto submitted in the second part of Point (34) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that the following differences in spelling should be added to the list of such differences to be inserted in the Articles replacing the present Articles 34 and 35 as differences to be ignored in determining whether one name is a homonym of another :—(1) the transcription of the semivowel or consonantal " i " as " y," " ei," " ej " or " ij " or (2) the use of the letters " f " and " ph ".

Articles 34 and 35 (words differing from one another solely by having as the accented syllable the syllable " an " or " en " : proposed insertion of a "Recommandation" urging avoidance)

5. Arising out of the discussion on the question dealt with in Conclusion 4 above, THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that a *Recommandation* be added both to Article 34 (generic names) and Article 35 (trivial names) urging authors to avoid selecting as a generic name or a trivial name a word which, in the former case, differs from an existing generic name only by having as its accented syllable the syllable " en " or " an " as the case may be, as in the case of the names *Tarentula* and *Tarantula*, and, in the latter case, differs only in the same respect from an existing trivial name in the same genus or group of allied genera.

Article 4 : (situation where the application of existing Provisions leads to the establishment of identical family names in different groups)

6. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the situation which arises when the application of Article 4 in its present form leads to the formation of identical family names for families in different parts of the Animal Kingdom, together with a note on this subject submitted by the Secretary in Point (35) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15. In this connection, the Commission had under consideration also correspondence on this subject which had passed between Commissioner H. Boschma (Netherlands) and the Secretary, consequent upon the former having proposed that means should be found to put an end to the anomaly created by the concurrent existence of the family name CYPRINIDAE in two parts of the Animal Kingdom (namely the Class Pelecypoda and the Class Pisces)(file Z.N.(S.)210).

In the discussion on this question, the view was generally expressed that it was a grave defect in the Articles of the *Règles* relating to the formation of family names that, although those Articles contained a provision (admittedly confused and inadequate as it was) regarding the application of the principle of priority to family names, those Articles contained no provision at all for the equally important question of the application of the Law of Homonymy. This was clearly a matter which should be dealt with in the Report on the reform of the provisions in the *Règles* relating to the nomenclature of families which it had been agreed that the Secretary should prepare for consideration at the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress. The existence of duplicate family names in different groups might not be a source of inconvenience to workers who specialised in a narrow field, but it constituted an indefensible anomaly in the classification of the Animal Kingdom as a whole. Pending the complete redrafting of Articles 4 and 5 of the *Règles*, it would be possible to deal with this problem on an *ad hoc* basis; it was desirable that this should be done, for the sooner the more glaring of the present anomalies were removed the better. It should normally be possible to find appropriate solutions on the lines adopted by the Commission in *Opinion* 140 when dealing with the question of the form of the family names to be constructed from the generic names *Merops* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves) and *Merope* Newman, 1838 (Class Insecta).

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that, without prejudice to any decisions that might be taken in the light of the comprehensive Report which the Secretary had been invited to prepare on the question of family names, there should be inserted in the *Règles* a provision that, where the application of Article 4 led to the establishment of two or more families having the same name, the case is to be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, whose duty it shall be to determine the name to be applied to each of the families concerned.

Article 4 (name to be applied to a family where two or more existing families are united on taxonomic grounds) : postponement of decision pending general inquiry

7. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by the late Dr. A. Steven Corbet (British Museum (Natural History), London) on the question of the procedure to be followed for determining the name of a family when two or more previously established families are united on taxonomic grounds (file Z.N.(S.)265), together with a note on the same subject submitted by the Secretary in Point (36) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15. The particular case raised by Dr. Corbet was concerned with the relative priority to be accorded to the family names RIODINIDAE (formerly ERYCINIDAE) and LIBYTHEIDAE (Class Insecta, Order LEPIDOPTERA), by an author who regarded these two groups as forming a single family only.

In the discussion on this question, the view was expressed that it was important that provision should be made in the *Règles* as soon as possible for determining the name to be applied to a family in the circumstances described above, for the problem involved was one of the most central of the issues awaiting settlement in the field of family names. It was felt, however, that, inconvenient and unsatisfactory as it was that there should be no rules governing this matter, it would be a mistake to prejudge the issue of the proposed investigation into the problem of the nomenclature of families by making a recommendation to the present Congress on this subject.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

> that the question of the provisions to be inserted in the *Règles* in regard to the name to be adopted for a family when two or more existing families were united on taxonomic grounds was one of the problems to which special attention should be paid in the Report on the nomenclature of families and super-generic groups below family level which at the meeting noted in the margin the Commission had invited the Secretary to prepare for their consideration at their meeting to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

Article 3 (definition of the expression " Latin " as there used)

8. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by Professor L. W. Grensted (Oxford University) in regard to the need for the introduction into Article 3 of the *Règles* of words defining the sense in which the word " Latin " is used in that Article (file Z.N.(S.)313), together with a proposal in regard thereto submitted by the Secretary in the first part of Point (37) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that a provision on the following lines be inserted in Article 3 :—
>
> > In the interpretation of this Article regard is to be paid to the fact that Latin as used for zoological nomenclature is a living language and therefore that, while classical Latin is necessarily the standard to which zoological names should, so far as possible, conform, that standard is not to be applied in such a way as to ignore later developments of the language or as to override considerations of scientific accuracy, uniformity, intelligibility or practical usefulness.

Article 4 (proposed removal of ambiguities regarding the method to be followed in forming a family name from a given generic name)

9. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by Professor L. W. Grensted (Oxford University) in regard to the need for removing from Article 4 the ambiguities regarding the procedure to be followed when forming a family name from a given generic name (file Z.N.(S.)313), together with a proposal in regard thereto submitted by the Secretary in the second part of Point (37) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that, in confirmation of the decision taken by the Eighth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Graz in 1910, that the word " stem " should be substituted for the word " root " in the English translation of Article 4 of the *Règles*, the word " thème " should be substituted for the word " radical " in the substantive French text of that Article ;

(2) that a provision to the following effect should be added to Article 4 :—

> The expression " stem " is to be interpreted as meaning either (1) the grammatical or classical stem or (2) a part of the stem, the choice to be made in favour of whichever of the foregoing methods both shows most clearly the relationship between the generic name on the one hand and the name of the family on the other and provides the simpler and more euphonious form compatible with that relationship.

Article 14 (agreement in gender with the generic name of a trivial name, when an adjective)

(Previous reference: Paris Session. 7th Meeting, Conclusion 12*)*

10. THE COMMISSION had under consideration (1) a proposal submitted by Mr. W. Parkinson Curtis (United Kingdom) and (2) a proposal submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) on the subject of the agreement in gender with the generic name of trivial names, when adjectival in form (file Z.N.(S.)214), together with a note on the same subject submitted by the Secretary as Point (38) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15. Mr. Parkinson Curtis suggested that the provision that an adjectival trivial name should agree in gender with the generic name should be deleted from Article 14 on the ground that it was obsolete and virtually unworkable. Professor Bonnet's proposals were designed to elucidate certain obscurities in regard to the application of the present provisions, while those submitted by the Secretary were more far-reaching in character, being designed to provide a means for determining the gender of every generic name. In Point (39) of the same Commission Paper (Commission Paper I.C.(48)15) a proposal was submitted that, for the convenience of those zoologists who were unfamiliar with the Latin language, there should be added to the Second Schedule to the *Règles* a statement of the rules governing the gender of Latin nouns, together with particulars of the better known of those nouns which were exceptions to the normal rules.

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 9)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, as the existing provisions of Article 14 regarding the agreement of adjectival trivial names in gender with the generic names with which they were conjoined, as also the supplementary provisions now proposed to be added to those provisions, were mandatory in character, it would not, as he had previously thought, be appropriate to include the proposed statement of the rules governing the gender of Latin nouns in the Schedule which was to replace the present *Appendice* to the *Règles*, for, as already agreed at the meeting noted in the margin, it was now to be made clear in the *Règles* that the provisions of that *Appendice*, and therefore of the Schedule which was to take its place, were non-mandatory in character. If, therefore, the Commission adopted the proposal that the rules governing the gender of Latin nouns when used as generic names should be added to the *Règles*, it would be necessary, in view of the mandatory character of those provisions, to place them in a Schedule distinct from that in which the existing *Appendice* was to be incorporated. The Acting President went on to say that he desired to supplement in one respect the proposal which he had submitted in this matter. It was not only the determination of the gender of Latin nouns which had proved a stumbling-block to those zoologists who had not had a classical education, for the rules governing the declension of Latin adjectives were far from simple and here too it was easy to fall into error. He accordingly proposed that particulars of the rules governing this matter also should be included in the suggested Schedule.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, having regard to the provisions of Article 3 of the *Règles*, it was essential and inevitable that a trivial name, when an adjective, should agree in gender with the generic name and that the application submitted by Mr. Parkinson Curtis should therefore be rejected ;

(Later reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 25)

(2) that it was essential that the clearest possible directions should be included in the *Règles* regarding the procedure to be followed for determining the gender of generic names ;

(3) in view of (2) above, to recommend :—

(a) that the following provisions should be inserted in the *Règles* for the purpose of determining the gender of nouns used as generic names and consequently for determining the gender in which trivial names, when adjectives, should be cited :—

(i) where a generic name or, in the case of a name consisting of a compound word, the terminal portion of such a name consists either of a classical Latin noun or of a noun, which, though unknown in classical Latin, is found in the later history of the Latin language, the generic name concerned is to be treated as being of the same gender as that of the Latin noun in question, save that, where a Latin noun occurs in more than one gender, the generic name consisting of that noun is to be treated as being of the masculine gender ;

(ii) where a generic name or, in the case of a name consisting of a compound word, the terminal portion of such a name, consists of a Latinised Greek noun either of the classical or non-classical period, the generic name concerned is to be treated as being of the same gender as the Latinised Greek word in question in like manner as in (i) above, Greek nouns for this purpose to retain their original gender, save in any case where a Greek noun became an integral part of the Latin language and, on being so incorporated, was treated as being of a gender different from that which it possessed prior to being so incorporated ;

(iii) where a generic name or, in the case of a name consisting of a compound word, the terminal portion of such a name consists of a word unknown in any stage of the Latin or Greek languages, except in so far as it is treated as a Latin or Latinised word for the purposes of zoological nomenclature, the following rules are to be followed in determining its gender :—

(1) if the word so treated as a Latin or Latinised noun has a termination found in the nominative singular of any of the Latin declensions, that word, if having a termination found in the first or fifth declensions, shall be treated as being of the feminine gender, and, if having a termination found in the second, third or fourth declension, shall be treated as being of the gender normally appropriate to a noun having that termination, save that every such word having the termination "-us," or, as the case may be, the termination "-es" shall be treated in the former case as being of the masculine gender, and in the latter case of the feminine gender ;

(2) if the word has a termination not found in the nominative singular of any of the five Latin declensions, that word is to be treated as being of the masculine gender.

(b) that, in order to facilitate the determination of the gender of any given generic name and the correct formation of adjectival trivial names :—

(i) there should be added to the *Règles* a Schedule, to be inserted at an appropriate point among the other Schedules, containing a concise statement of the rules governing :—

(1) the gender of Latin nouns and of Greek nouns, when latinised, together with particulars of the better known of such nouns, the gender of which differed from that normally appropriate for a noun belonging to the declension concerned and having the termination in question ;

(2) the formation of the respective genders of Latin adjectives and of Greek adjectives, when latinised, together with particulars relating to the better known of such adjectives, the genders of which were not formed in accordance with the normal rules ;

(ii) there should be inserted in relation to sub-paragraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 words prescribing that the gender of generic names is to be determined in accordance with the rules specified in (a) above as supplemented by the Schedule specified in (b) (i) above, and the gender of adjectives is to be formed in accordance with the rules specified in the said Schedule.

Article 25, Proviso (c) (point of time as from which effective)

11. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) for the clarification of the point of time decided upon by the Tenth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Budapest in 1927 as the point of time as from which the proviso (c) then added to Article 25 was to come into operation, submitted by the Secretary in Point (40) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that the provisions of Proviso (c) to Article 25 came into operation as from midnight G.M.T. (Greenwich Mean Time) 31st December, 1930/1st January, 1931.

"Appendice" to the "Règles" (proposed correction of an error in section "G")

12. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by Commissioner H. Boschma (Netherlands) for the correction of a minor error in Section "G" of the *Appendice* to the *Règles* (file Z.N.(G.)10), together with a note thereon submitted by the Secretary in Point (41) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

(1) to take note that the statement contained in the sentence "the soft aspirate may be used to represent the Arabic *aïn*," which appeared at the end of the sixteenth of the recommendations enumerated in Section G of the *Appendice* to the *Règles*, shortly to be converted into a Schedule, was incorrect ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 22)

(2) to recommend that the error referred to in (1) above should be corrected when the wording of the recommendations set forth in Section G of the *Appendice* were revised as agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin.

Article 14 (status of a trivial name consisting of an unchanged surname of a modern personage treated as a Latin or Latinised word)

13. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by the late Professor T. D. A. Cockerell (U.S.A.) (file Z.N.(S.)165) that a ruling should be given on the question whether a trivial name consisting of an unchanged surname of a modern personage but treated as a Latin or Latinised word should be corrected to comply with the requirements of Article 14 (see Cockerell, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 89), together with a note thereon submitted by the Secretary in Point (42) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that until fairly recently almost the only cases of the kind referred to in Professor Cockerell's application were those found in the works of French authors of the early decades of the XIXth century. Within recent years there had, however, been a recrudescence of this type of trivial name, as the result—as it appeared from correspondence—of a misreading of the first paragraph of Article 14 which provided that a trivial name might be a noun in the nominative singular in apposition to the generic name. Trivial names consisting of unlatinised modern patronymics must however be regarded as defective, for such a method of forming a trivial name based on a modern patronymic was inconsistent with the intention, if not with the actual provisions, of the third paragraph of Article 14. Moreover, even where such names were printed in italics it was difficult to sustain an argument that a name, so formed, had been " latinisé " within the meaning of Article 3 of the *Règles.* Whatever decision the Commission might take on the question raised by Professor Cockerell, it was desirable that the provisions in Article 14 relating to the formation of trivial names based upon the surnames of modern personages should be co-ordinated with the general provisions relating to the formation of trivial names specified in the first paragraph of that Article.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where a trivial name is published in the form of an unchanged surname of a modern personage (e.g. where, to honour the Frenchman Cerisy, Godart published in 1824 a

trivial name *cerisy* in the binominal combination *Papilio cerisy*) and (as in the example cited above) the author treated the name, so formed, as a Latin or Latinised word, the form of the trivial name so published is to be corrected so as to comply with the requirements of the paragraph of Article 14 which deals with the formation of trivial names based on modern patronymics (the name *cerisy* in the example quoted above thus being corrected to *cerisyi*), the name so corrected to retain priority as from the date on which it was published in the incorrect form (i.e. in the above case from 1824, the date when the name was published in the incorrect form *cerisy*) and to continue to be attributed to the author by whom it was so published ;

(2) that Article 14 should be amended in such a way as to make it clear that the provision in the first paragraph of that Article that a trivial name may be a noun in the nominative singular in apposition to the generic name does not apply to trivial names based on the surnames of modern personages.

Article 14 (status of a trivial name consisting of a phonetic reproduction of the initials of one or more persons)

14. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by Mr. R. G. Fennah (St. Lucia, B.W.I.) (file Z.N.(S.)163) that a ruling should be given on the question whether a trivial name based upon the phonetic reproduction of the initials of a zoologist or zoologists complied with the requirements of the *Règles* (see Fennah, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 89), together with a note thereon submitted by the Secretary in the first part of Point (43) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to recommend that words should be inserted in Article 14 to make it clear that a trivial name (like a generic name) may consist of an arbitrary combination of letters, a trivial name so formed to be treated as an indeclinable noun in the nominative singular ;

(2) that, on the adoption of the recommendation submitted in (1) above, a trivial name consisting of a phonetic reproduction of the initials of one or more persons would, if treated as a Latin word, comply with the requirements of Article 14.

Article 8 (conversion of "Recommandations" into mandatory provisions)

(*Later reference : Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 37)

15. In the course of the discussion on the proposal dealt with in Conclusion 14 above, attention was drawn to the fact that in its present form Article 8 was defective, since the second and third of the three provisions concerned (of which the third was exactly parallel to the provision which it had now been agreed to be added to Article 14) appeared not as mandatory provisions but, quite inappropriately, as *Recommandations.*

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that on the forthcoming revision of the text of the *Règles*, the two provisions which at present appeared as *Recommandations* annexed to Article 8 be converted into mandatory provisions, subject as regards the second, to names falling within the scope of subparagraph (h) being excluded from the scope of sub-paragraph (k).

Articles 8 & 14 (proposed "Recommandation" condemning names suggesting a bizarre or other objectionable meaning in some language other than Latin)

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 12)

16. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* invalidating names which, while purporting to be Latinised words, were combinations of syllables conveying in some language other than Latin a meaning that was bizarre or otherwise improper (file Z.N.(S.)352), together with a note thereon submitted by the Secretary in the second part of Point (43) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

In submitting this proposal Professor Bonnet had drawn attention to the generic names *Ochisme* and *Marichisme* published in 1904 by the British zoologist Kirkaldy, names which might appear innocuous to any non-English speaking zoologist but which to any person acquainted with the English language were obviously unsuitable and improper being no more than the English expressions "O, kiss me" and "Mary, kiss me" written together as though the three words were one. Such names were on a par with names like *Vienferdodoleon* or *Prentoncafelea* if coined by an irresponsible Frenchman. Names of this kind were open to strong objection and their publication should be prohibited.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that there should be added to Article 8 a *Recommandation* condemning the selection as a generic name of a word which purported to be an arbitrary combination of letters but which, when pronounced, appeared to be a word or words in some language other than Latin, especially where those words had a bizarre, comic or otherwise objectionable meaning, and urging authors to refrain from publishing such names ;

(2) that a *Recommandation* in terms similar to those specified in (1) above but relating to trivial names should be inserted in Article 14.

Article 23 (proposed clarification in certain respects)

17. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the following papers relating to the use of parentheses (round brackets) in cases where subgeneric names are cited in addition to generic names or the status of a trivial name is altered in a given genus.

(a) a request received from Dr. C. F. W. Muesebeck (U.S.A.) for a ruling on the interpretation of Article 23 in cases where a species is originally described as being both in a genus and in a subgenus and later the subgenus is elevated to generic rank and the species is transferred to the genus so erected (file Z.N.(S.) 128) (see Muesebeck, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 92);

(b) a request received from Professor R. Chester Hughes (U.S.A.) for a ruling on the interpretation of Article 23 in relation to the use of parentheses (round brackets) when citing the name of an author of a subspecific trivial name when that name appears in conjunction with the same generic name but not in the same relationship thereto as when originally published (file Z.N.(S.)129) (see Hughes, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomenc.*, **1** : 91–92);

(c) a note on the above cases submitted by the Secretary in Point (44) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

PURCHASED

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that Article 23 should be redrafted, so far as necessary, to make it clear that the provisions of that Article apply only to the case of a species or subspecies which is originally described as belonging to one nominal genus but later is transferred to another nominal genus, and therefore that it is irrelevant for the purposes of Article 23 whether a species or subspecies, when first described, in addition to being placed in a genus was placed also in a subgenus, as also is the question whether a species or subspecies originally published in a genus without a subgenus being cited is later cited under both a generic and a subgeneric name and *vice versa* :

(2) that the name of an author is not to be placed in brackets (parentheses) when a trivial name originally published as the name of a species is

THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, have great pleasure in expressing their grateful thanks to the UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION (U.N.E.S.C.O.) for the financial assistance afforded towards the cost of producing the present volume.

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Notice to subscribers regarding the arrangements made for the completion of volume 1 and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5

The following arrangements have been made for completing volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5 :—

Volume 1 : A concluding Part (Part 12), containing, *inter alia*, the Title Page, Table of Contents, and alphabetical subject index, will be published shortly.

Volume 2 : This volume, like Volume 1, will be devoted to the publication of applications in regard to nomenclatorial problems submitted by specialists to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. Publication will commence at an early date.

Volume 3 : This volume, which is now complete in 9 Parts, is devoted to the publication of the memoranda, reports and other documents considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at their meetings held in Paris in July 1948.

Volume 4 : This volume will be devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July* 1948. Parts 1-9 have already been published and the remaining Parts are in the press.

Volume 5 : At the request of the Bureau of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, this volume will be devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July* 1948, together with the Reports submitted to the Congress by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature.

INQUIRIES

All inquiries regarding publications should be addressed to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, and all inquiries regarding the scientific work of the Commission to the Secretary to the Commission at the following addresses :—

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7, England.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : Secretariat of the Commission, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.

Printed in Great Britain by METCHIM AND SON, LTD., Westminster, London

VOLUME 4. Parts 10/12
pp. 255—350.

9th *June*, 1950

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

PURCHASED

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

CONTENTS :

The Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July 1948 :

Page
Conclusions of Ninth Meeting (*concluding portion*) - - - - - 255-271
Conclusions of Tenth Meeting - - - 272-279
Conclusions of Eleventh Meeting - - - 280-305
Conclusions of Twelfth Meeting (*first instalment*) - - - - - 306-350

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth
International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948,
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the
International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
at the Publications Office of the Trust
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1950

Price One pound, eight shillings.

(*All rights reserved*)

later treated as the name of a subspecies and *vice versa*, so long as that species or subspecies is cited in its original nominal genus.

Article 25 (question whether a description of the work of an animal but not of the animal itself constitutes an " indication ")

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 16)

18. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a request submitted by Commissioner J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (file Z.N.(S.)140) for a ruling on the question whether the description of the work of an animal (for example, the borings made by a beetle), unaccompanied by any description of the animal itself or of any part of it constitutes an " indication " for the purposes of Article 25 (see Bradley, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 93–94), together with a note thereon submitted by the Secretary in Point (45) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) the insertion in Article 25 of words to make it clear that the description of the work of an animal constitutes an " indication " for the purposes of Article 25, even if unaccompanied by a description of the animal itself and that a name so given is not to be rejected on the grounds that it is based upon a hypothetical form ;

(2) the addition to Article 25 of a *Recommandation* urging authors, so far as possible, to avoid giving names to new taxonomic units, where those units are based solely upon the work of an animal.

Article 25 (Question whether a generic name based solely upon a figure is published with an " indication ")

19. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a request submitted by Dr. Harald A. Rehder (U.S.A.) (file Z.N.(S.)68) for a ruling on the question whether a generic name based solely upon a figure satisfies the requirements of Article 25 (see Rehder, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 94–95), together with a note thereon published by the Secretary in 1945 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 95–96) and a supplementary note submitted by the Secretary in Point (46) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in Article 25 to make it clear that a generic name published prior to 1st January, 1931, on a legend to a plate or plates but without explanatory matter is to be treated as having been published with an " indication " for the purposes of Article 25.

Trivial name "aegyptiellus" Strand, 1909, conditionally published for a subspecies of "Halictus morbillosus" Kirchbaumer, 1873: status of, determined

20. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by the late Professor T. D. A. Cockerell (U.S.A.) (file Z.N.(S.)45) for a ruling on the authorship and date to be attributed to a trivial name published conditionally in the Order Hymenoptera (Class Insecta) (Cockerell, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 97), together with a note submitted by the Secretary in Point (47) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(*Previous reference : Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 17)

> that the point of principle raised in the application submitted had been settled by the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin at the time when *Opinion* 49 was under consideration and therefore that the trivial name *aegyptiellus* given conditionally as the trivial name of a subspecies of *Halictus morbillosus* Kirchbaumer, 1873, ranked for priority as from 1909, the year in which it had been published by Strand and is to be attributed to that author.

Article 25 (significance of the citation of the host species in an original description of a parasite)

21. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by President Karl Jordan (United Kingdom) (file Z.N.(S.)167) that a ruling should be given on the question whether the citation, in the case of a parasitic species, of the name of the host species, unaccompanied by any description of the parasite itself, constituted an "indication" for the purposes of Article 25 (see Jordan, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 97–98), together with a note thereon submitted by the Secretary in Point (48) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 23)

> that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that the citation of the name of the host species of a parasitic species, unaccompanied by any other particulars does not constitute an "indication" for the purposes of Article 25 but that the provision regarding the significance of the citation of a type locality in an original description which at the meeting noted in the margin they had agreed to recommend should be inserted in the *Règles* should be expanded to cover also the citation, in the case of a parasitic species, of the name of the host species.

Article 25 (significance of the citation of a geological horizon in an original description of a fossil species)

22. Arising out of the discussion on the preceding item, THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that the provision recorded in Conclusion 21 above should be extended to cover also the citation, in the

case of a fossil species, of the geological horizon in which the fossil was found, where no descriptive matter is given.

Article 25 (meaning of the expression " le plus anciennement designé ")

23. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by Dr. Satyu Yamaguti (Japan) (file Z.N.(S.)125) that a ruling should be given regarding the manner in which the expression " le plus anciennement désigné " as used in Article 25 should be interpreted (see Yamaguti, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 102), together with a note thereon submitted by the Secretary in Point (49) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 18)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the principal point raised by Dr. Yamaguti had been settled by the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin that there should be added to the *Règles* provisions prescribing the method to be followed in determining the exact date to be assigned, for the purposes of the Law of Priority, to any given book. It would be useful, however, if the Commission were now to deal with the position which arose when two competing names were found to have been published in different books on the same date.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing that, where two books, each containing a different name for the same taxonomic unit or the same name for different taxonomic units are published on the same day or, under the decisions taken by the present (Paris) Congress, are to be treated as having been so published, by reason of the exact date of publication of the books concerned being unknown, the question as to which of the two names is to be given priority over the other is to be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision.

Article 28 (relative advantages of the " First Reviser " and " Page Precedence " principles), Secretary to submit Report on

24. In the course of the discussion regarding the relative priority to be accorded to identical names published on the same day in different works recorded in the immediately preceding Conclusion, a discussion took place also on the cognate question of the provisions in Article 28 in its application to different names published for the same species, or the same name published for two or more different species, in the same book. It was generally agreed that the present wording of this Article was unsatisfactory. At the same time the view was expressed that it was desirable that consideration should be given to the practical difficulties involved in applying the " first reviser " principle laid down in that Article and that in this connection an examination should be made of the relative advantages on the one hand of retaining the " first reviser " principle and on the other of substituting for this provision a provision prescribing that in such cases relative priority should be determined in accordance with the principle of page precedence.

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 17)

At the conclusion of the discussion, THE COMMISSION agreed :—

> to invite the Secretary to make a study, in the light of the foregoing discussion, of the problems involved in Article 28 and to submit a Report thereon, with recommendations, at the earliest possible moment.

Article 22 (Dr. Jacot's proposal that this article be deleted)

25. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)12) submitted by the late Dr. Arthur P. Jacot (U.S.A.) that Article 22 should be deleted from the *Règles* and that in its place there should be inserted a *Recommandation* that authors' names should not normally be cited (see Jacot, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 90), together with a counter-proposal submitted by the Secretary in the first part of Point (50) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

> to reject the proposal in regard to Article 22 submitted by the late Dr. Arthur P. Jacot.

Article 23 (proposal by the American Malacological Union that this Article be deleted)

26. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a Resolution (file Z.N.(S.)142) adopted by the American Malacological Union urging the deletion from the *Règles* of Article 23 (see Robertson, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 93), together with a counter-proposal submitted by the Secretary in the second part of Point (50) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

> to reject the proposal in regard to Article 23 submitted by the American Malacological Union.

Article 1 and Articles 34 & 35 : co-ordination of, in relation to the names of species transferred from the Animal Kingdom to the Vegetable Kingdom

27. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that with the consideration of Point (50) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15, the Commission had concluded their examination of all the proposals affecting the interpretation of the *Règles* published in Part 5 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* with the exception of a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)155) submitted by himself (Hemming, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 103–106) on the interpretation of Article 34 in relation to the provisions in regard to the status of names of genera which were originally described as belonging to the Animal Kingdom but were later transferred to the Vegetable Kingdom. There was no real doubt, on any reasonable interpretation of the wording actually used in the substantive French text, that paragraph (3) of Article 1 (though a poorly-drafted provision) governed Article 34 and therefore that, where a genus, originally described as belonging to the Animal Kingdom, is later transferred to the Vegetable Kingdom, the generic name published for that genus retains its original status in zoological nomenclature for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy (Article 34). It would be well, however, to take advantage of the present clean-up of the *Règles* to make this clear. The same principle should be made clear also in relation to the application of paragraph (3) of Article 1 to Article 35 (i.e. to the Law of Homonymy in relation to specific names and specific trivial names).

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that the provisions contained in the concluding portion of Article 1 should be redrafted, so as to bring out more clearly that those provisions were concerned with the status in zoological nomenclature of the generic and specific names given to a species in the belief that that species belonged to the Animal Kingdom, when later that genus or species was treated as belonging to the Vegetable Kingdom ;

(2) that such drafting amendments should be made in Article 34 (generic homonymy) as might be necessary to ensure that it was consistent with Article 1 and that regard should be paid to the same consideration in the choice of the wording to be employed in the Article which (as agreed at the meeting noted in the margin) is to replace the existing Article 35 (specific homonymy).

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 1)

Article 25 (authorship of *nomina nuda* and manuscript names when first validly published with an "indication")

28. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) regarding the authorship to be attributed to a name, when first published with an "indication," in cases where the name in question had, prior to being so published, been either a *nomen nudum* or a manuscript name, together with a proposal in regard thereto submitted by the Secretary in Point (51) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 18)

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted either in Article 25 or some other part of the *Règles* to make it clear that, when a name is validly published in conditions which satisfy the provisos to Article 25 and the name in question accordingly acquires rights under the Law of Priority and, prior to being so published, that name had either been published as a *nomen nudum* or had been a manuscript name, the name is to be attributed to the author by whom it was first published in conditions which satisfied the requirements of the said provisos to Article 25 and not to the earlier author by whom it had either been published as a *nomen nudum* or had been given currency as a manuscript name.

Article 30 (interpretation of Rule (g))

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 72)

29. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) relating to the interpretation of Rule (g) in Article 30 submitted by the Secretary in Point (52) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, since this proposal had been drafted, the point at issue had been dealt with by the Commission, when considering the proposal submitted in Point (11) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12. No action was called for, therefore, on the part of the Commission as regards the present proposal.

THE COMMISSION took note of the above statement.

Title to be given to the " Règles " as amended by the present Congress

30. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) relating to the title to be applied to the *Règles* as revised at the present Congress, submitted by the Secretary in Point (53) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that an Article should be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing :—

  (a) that the title of the *Règles* as amended by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held in Paris in 1948 shall be the " Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique, 1901–1948 " ;

  (b) that the foregoing *Règles* may be referred to by the short title " *Règles*, 1901-1948 " ;

(2) that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* revised as in (1)(a) above, repealing the *Règles* previously in force as from the date on which the revised *Règles* come into force.

Addition of a further Schedule or Schedules to the " Regles " for recording decisions by the Commission on the invalidity of books or names

31. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) regarding the method in future to be adopted for recording decisions taken by the Commission either (1) that a given work is not available or (2) that a given name or class of name (for example the class of name dealt with in *Opinion* 124) is not available, submitted by the Secretary in Point (54) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

(*Later reference : Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 19)

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that decisions taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (a) that a given book is not available for nomenclatorial purposes or (b) that a given name is not available should be recorded in a further Schedule or, if found more convenient, in two further Schedules to be attached to the *Règles;*

(2) that it should be left to the jurists to determine the order in which the several Schedules to the *Règles* should be arranged.

Words having the terminations " -idae " and " -inae " : restriction on use other than for names of families and subfamilies

32. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)200) submitted by Commissioner H. Boschma (Netherlands) proposing an amendment to the *Règles* to secure that words having the terminations " -idae " and " -inae," prescribed in Article 4 as the terminations for the names of families and subfamilies, shall not be used either (1) as names for suprageneric groups other than those respectively specified in Article 4 or (2) as names of genera or of units of lower rank, except where such a termination is required for a trivial name formed in the first declension in the genitive singular. At the same time also the Commission had before them a proposal on this subject submitted by the Secretary in Point (55) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15. In his application on this subject, Commissioner Boschma referred to the highly objectionable practice adopted by certain authors in coining names of the above kind as the names (for example) of sections of subfamilies and cited in this connection the use by Hancock (1906) of the name Bufonidae as the name of a section of the subfamily Tetriginae of the family ACRIDIIDAE (Class Insecta, Order Orthoptera).

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that provisions should be inserted at appropriate points in the *Règles:*—

(a) prohibiting the use of words having either the termination " -idae " or the termination "-inae" as the names of suprageneric groups other than families or, as the case may be, subfamilies, and invalidating such names when published for such purposes;

(b) prohibiting the use of words having either of the terminations specified in (a) above as the names either (i) of genera or (ii) of taxonomic units of lower rank and invalidating such names when published for such purposes, save in the case of a trivial name which consists of the name of a place or personage of which the nominative singular has the termination "-ina" or "-ida," cited in the genitive singular (as, for example, the trivial name *catharinae*).

Article 12 (redrafting of, to eliminate confusion between taxonomy and nomenclature)

33. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) for the redrafting of Article 12 of the *Règles* in such a way as to eliminate the confusion between taxonomic ideas and nomenclatorial facts which at present marred that Article, submitted by the Secretary in Point (56) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

that Article 12 of the *Règles* should be redrafted on the following lines:—

When a specimen or specimens originally described as representing a species is or are treated by a later author as representing a subspecies, the name published as the specific trivial name of the species becomes the subspecific trivial name of the subspecies, and *vice versa*.

Article 7 (redrafting of, to eliminate confusion between taxonomy and nomenclature)

34. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) that Article 7 should be redrafted to eliminate the confusion between taxonomy and nomenclature implicit in the present wording, submitted by the Secretary in Point (57) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

that Article 7 of the *Règles* should be redrafted on the following lines:—

When a species or group of species originally described as constituting a genus is treated by a later author as constituting a subgenus, the name published as the generic name for the genus becomes the subgeneric name of the subgenus, and *vice versa*.

Articles 6 & 11 : co-ordination of texts

35. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) that the discrepancy between the wording employed in the parallel Articles 6 and 11 of the *Règles* (a discrepancy which was undoubtedly due to inadvertence in drafting) should be rectified by amending Article 6 so as to bring the wording used in that Article into line with that employed in Article 11, submitted by the Secretary in Point (58) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that, in order to bring the texts of Articles 6 and 11 into line with one another, the words " *et recommandations* " should be inserted in Article 6 after the word " *règles.*"

Articles 19 & 32 : co-ordination of texts

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 12)

36. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled at this point that among the propositions submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) was one which also related to the formal co-ordination of two Articles of the *Règles*, which he suggested might be conveniently considered by the Commission at the present point. This proposition (file Z.N.(S.)352) aimed at securing that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that Article 32 did not impose any limitation on the generality of the provisions of Article 19 of the *Règles.*

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to ensure the co-ordination of Articles 19 and 32 by making it clear that nothing in the last-named Article detracts from the generality of the provisions of Article 19.

Article 8 : (amendment of provision proposed in replacement of second "Recommandation"

37. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)253) submitted by Professor L. W. Grensted (United Kingdom) that *Recommandation* (2)(b) to Article 8, relating to the formation of a compound name where the words used in forming that compound name are of Greek origin, should be amended so as to eliminate the sentence condoning the formation of such a name in an incorrect manner, such a sentence being unnecessary and inappropriate in a non-mandatory provision such as a *Recommandation.* It was bad enough to have such a generic name as *Hippopotamus* which Linnaeus had presumably thought meant a " river-horse " but which, in fact, through being incorrectly formed, meant a " horse-river," but it was intolerable that an incorrectly formed name of this kind should be gratuitously referred to in a provision which was ostensibly concerned only to show the correct manner of forming compound names. At the same time the Commission had before them a proposal on the same subject submitted by the Secretary in Point (59) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

It was pointed out in discussion that, since the foregoing proposals had been formulated, the Commission had agreed to recommend that the *Recommandations* to Article 8 should be converted into mandatory provisions. This decision made it necessary that in the interest of stability in nomenclature words should be inserted to preserve compound names consisting of words of Greek origin, even when formed in a totally incorrect manner (as in the case of the name *Hippopotamus*). It was suggested that this end might best be secured by confining to a bare enumeration of the permissible types of generic names the portions of *Recommandation* (2) to be made mandatory and by retaining as *Recommandations* the comments included in the present provision in regard to certain of the types of names there enumerated.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 15)

(1) that, when, as agreed at the meeting noted in the margin, the second of the two *Recommandations* to Article 8 was redrafted as a mandatory provision, that provision should be confined to a bare enumeration of the types of words there listed as words admissible for selection as generic names, together with appropriate examples, and that the comments which were at present attached to, or which at present constitute, items (a), (b), (c), (f), (h), (δ), (ϵ) and (ζ), (i), (j) should be given as *Recommandations* attached to the provisions relating to the items concerned ;

(2) that, in the case of category (b), the whole of the existing comment should be deleted, namely, the words " in which the attributive should precede the principal word," the examples cited immediately thereafter and the whole of the following paragraph (" This does not . . . *Biorhiza* ") and that, in place thereof, there should be inserted a *Recommandation* on the following lines :—

(*For a proposed addition to this " Recommandation ", See Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion* 20)

> Where a name consisting of a compound word is formed from words of Greek origin, the attribute should, if it expresses a quality, precede the principal word, but where it expresses either an action or an activity or a state, may either precede or follow the word with which it is conjoined.

Articles 34 & 35 : relative precedence to be given to generic and subgeneric homonyms and to specific and subspecific homonyms of the same date

38. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) for the conversion into a mandatory provision of the addition relating to the relative precedence to be accorded to homonyms of identical date made to Article 36 by the XIth International Congress of Zoology at Padua in 1930 which at present appears as a *Recommandation*, submitted by the Secretary in Point (60) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) pointed out that this provision was totally valueless in the form of a *Recommandation* only, and that it was only if it became a mandatory provision that it could have any practical utility. That this provision appeared in the *Règles* as a *Recommandation* and not as a mandatory provision might well be due to editorial inadvertence, for it was expressly stated in the Commission's *Opinion* 124, which dealt with another aspect of the same matter, that the provision in question was an " amendment to Article 36 ", a statement which would not have been correct if this provision had been no more than a *Recommandation*. In any case this *Recommandation* was quite inappropriately placed in Article 36, to which it was unrelated in subject.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that the provision relating to homonyms of identical date added by the Eleventh International Congress of Zoology to Article 36 in the form of a *Recommandation* should be converted into a mandatory provision and that the portion concerned with generic and subgeneric names should be related to Article 34 and that concerned with specific and subspecific trivial names to Article 35, when the last-named Article was redrafted in accordance with the decision already taken at the meeting noted in the margin.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 1)

Article 36 (re-allocation to Articles 34 and 35 of " Recommandations ")

39. Arising out of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 38 above, THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 1)

(1) that, when Article 36 was redrafted in accordance with the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin, the provisions which at present appear as *Recommandations* attached to that Article should, subject to any necessary drafting amendments, be allocated respectively to Article 34, so far as generic names are concerned, and to Article 35, so far as trivial names are concerned ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 9)

(2) that, consequential upon the recommendation agreed to be submitted to give effect to a correction made in Article 4 by the Eighth International

Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Graz in 1910, a corresponding correction (by the substitution of the word "*thème*" for the word "*radical*") should be made in the third and fourth of the unnumbered *Recommandations* at present attached to Article 36.

Status of certain alleged subgeneric names: completion of decision given in "Opinion" 124

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion* 9)

40. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)394) for the completion of the decision regarding the status of certain terms, published in circumstances which had something of the appearance of giving to those names a subgeneric status recorded in *Opinion* 124, submitted by the Secretary in Point (61) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 13th Meeting Conclusion* 2)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that this question, which had first been raised by Dr. Ashley B. Gurney (U.S.A.), was one of a number which arose in connection with the failure of the Commission on some occasions in the past to deal in their *Opinions* with the whole of a given problem submitted to them for decision. A proposal for dealing with this anomaly had been received from Commissioner H. Boschma (Netherlands) and would be brought before the Commission at a later meeting. In the case of *Opinion* 124, the defect which required to be rectified was that, as worded, that *Opinion* applied only to terms of the class in question (alleged subgeneric names), as published by Linnaeus in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae*, whereas the decision in that *Opinion* should have covered the use of such terms in all the works of Linnaeus, for, when he used such terms in other works, he always did so in a sense similar to that adopted in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae*. It was desirable also that, when the Commission made this correction, they should extend the decision in regard to the use of the terms in question by Linnaeus to cover the use of the same or similar terms by Fabricius (J.C.), who in this matter had followed a practice exactly parallel to that adopted by Linnaeus.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, where in any of his works (and not merely in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae*) Linnaeus, when citing the name of a species, placed an intermediate term or intermediate terms between the name of the genus and the trivial name of the species, an intermediate term so used was not to be treated as having thereby acquired the status of a subgeneric name as from the date of being so published ;

(2) that the decision set out in (1) above applies also to intermediate terms placed between the generic name and the trivial name of a species by Fabricius (J.C.) in any of his works ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decision specified in (1) and (2) above.

" Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " : status of names placed on

41. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* clarifying the status of a generic name, once it has been placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology ", submitted by the Secretary in Point (62) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

(*Previous reference:* *Paris Session, 8th Meeting, Conclusion* 4)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) observed that the object of this proposal was to lay down clearly the status of a generic name once it was placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology ". This proposal did not prejudge in any way the general investigation into the problem of finding ways and means for stabilising zoological nomenclature, which at their meeting held that morning the Commission, at the request of the Section on Nomenclature, had undertaken to carry out before the next meeting of the Congress. All that the present proposal did was to provide a breathing space between the time when a mistake in the " Official List " was detected and the time when action was taken to correct that mistake.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to recommend that there should be inserted in the *Règles* provisions :—

(a) prescribing that, for the purpose of promoting the stabilisation of generic nomenclature, there shall be an " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology ", on which shall be inscribed the following classes of generic name, each name being accompanied by the name of the type species of the genus concerned and particulars as to the manner in which that species was so designated, indicated, or selected :—

(i) every generic name validated by the Commission under its plenary powers or for which the type species has been similarly designated ;

  - (ii) the name of every genus, when an available name, in respect of which or its type species the Commission has rendered an *Opinion*;
  - (iii) the name of any genus which the Commission, in consultation with specialists concerned, considers it desirable to stabilise;
- (b) directing that, when a generic name has been placed on the " Official List ", that name is to be used, in preference to any other name, for the species which is the type species of the genus so named, save that, where, as agreed at the meeting noted in the margin, the Commission, in order not to appear to prejudge a purely taxonomic question, place on the " Official List " the names of two or more genera, the respective type species of which are regarded by some systematists as belonging to different genera but by others as being congeneric with one another, the later published of the two generic names in question is for use only by those workers who regard the respective type species of the two genera concerned as not being congeneric with one another;
- (c) specifying that, where a generic name belonging either to the second or the third of the classes specified in (a) above is found, after having been placed on the " Official List ", either (1) not to be an available name or (2) not to be the oldest name available, there being an older name for a genus having as its type species a species either subjectively identified with, or subjectively regarded as being congeneric with, the type species of the genus the name of which has been placed on the " Official List " or (3) to have as its type species some species other than the type species attributed to it in the " Official List ", the generic name in question is nevertheless not to be discarded in favour of some other name or used in a sense different from that specified in the " Official List ", unless and until the Commission, on having the facts laid before it, shall so direct;

(d) prescribing any other provisions relating to the " Official List " which the present Congress may enact in regard to the said " Official List " ;

(e) laying it down that it is the duty of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to maintain the said "Official List " and to foster its development by every means in its power ;

(2) agreed that the duties imposed upon the Commission in (1) above should be specified in the By-Laws of the Commission when revised in the light of the decisions taken by the present (Paris) Congress.

" Official List of Specific Names in Zoology " : establishment of, and status of names placed on

(*For a decision to alter the title of this " Official List," see Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion* 5).

42. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(G.)48), that there should be established an " Official List of Trivial Names in Zoology " parallel to the " Official List " established for generic names by the Ninth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Monaco in 1913, submitted by the Secretary in Point (63) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) pointed out that, although the Plenary Powers Resolution adopted by the Congress in 1913 applied both to generic names and to trivial names, the " Official List " established by the Congress at the same meeting was concerned only with generic names. This was an anomaly which should be corrected. The " Official List of Trivial Names " now proposed would be an exact parallel of the existing " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " and the status of names placed on these " Official Lists " would be subject to similar regulations. A reference to the new " Official List " would be needed in the body of the *Règles*. A parallel reference would be needed also in the By-Laws of the Commission, when revised in the light of the decisions taken by the present Congress.

In the discussion which ensued, general agreement was expressed with the proposal that there should be established an " Official List " of the kind proposed. It would provide a valuable means both for recording decisions taken by the Commission in regard to the names of particular species and also for stabilising the names of important species. The view was expressed however that it might be better if this " Official List " were given the title of " Official List of Specific Names in Zoology " rather than the title of " Official List of Trivial Names in Zoology ".

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) agreed to recommend the insertion in the *Règles* of provisions prescribing :

(For a later decision modifying the title of the " Official List " here established, see Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion 5)

(a) that there should be an " Official List of Specific Names in Zoology ", parallel to the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology", on which should be inscribed the oldest available trivial name of any species, the specific name of which it was desired should be stabilised, together with the generic name, in combination with which the trivial name in question was originally published ;

(b) that the status of a specific name, once placed on the " Official List of Specific Names in Zoology " shall be subject to regulations similar to those prescribed for the status of generic names placed on the " Official List for Generic Names in Zoology ", that is to say, a specific name once stabilised in this way is to be used in preference to any other name for the species in question and the trivial name in question is not to be replaced by any other trivial name, even if later it is found either (1) that the trivial name in question is not an available name or (2) that it is not the oldest available trivial name for the species in question, unless, and until, on the facts being laid before the Commission, the Commission shall so direct ;

(c) that the names to be included in the " Official List of Specific Names in Zoology " should include :—

(i) every name validated by the Commission under its plenary powers ;

(ii) any name, being an available name, on which the Commission has at any time rendered an *Opinion* ;

(iii) the name of the type species of any genus, the name of which is placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology ", save where such a name is not, either objectively or subjectively, the oldest available name for the species in question, in which case there shall be added to the " Official List of Specific Names in

Zoology" the oldest available name for the taxonomic species concerned;

(iv) the oldest available name for:—

(1) species of importance in medicine, agriculture, veterinary science and other fields of applied biology, in stratigraphy and in the teaching of zoology;

(2) species, the nomenclature of which the Commission, in consultation with specialists concerned, consider it desirable to stabilise;

(d) that the insertion on the "Official List" of a given specific name is not to be interpreted as an expression of opinion on the taxonomic question whether the animal so named should be regarded as being on the one hand a distinct species or on the other hand a subspecies of some other species;

(e) that it is the duty of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to maintain the said "Official List" and to foster its development by every means in its power;

(2) agreed that the duties imposed upon the Commission in (1) above should be specified in the By-Laws of the Commission, when revised in the light of the decisions taken by the present (Paris) Congress.

"Official List of Generic Names in Zoology": additional provision relating to

43. Arising out of the discussion in regard to the scope of the proposed "Official List of Specific Names in Zoology" recorded in Conclusion 42 above, THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

that the recommendation specified in Conclusion 42(1)(c)(iv)(1) above in relation to names to be admitted to the "Official List of Specific Names in Zoology" should be applied also in relation to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology."

Tenth Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session: date and time noted

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 8th Meeting, Conclusion* 7)

44. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) proposed that, now that the Commission had completed their examination of the recommendations submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15, they should adjourn until the next day. As already announced, their next meeting, which would be held concurrently with the second meeting of the Section on Nomenclature, would take place on the morning of the following day (Saturday, 24th July, 1948) at 0900 hours.

THE COMMISSION took note of the above statement.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned at* 2315 *hours*).

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 21st–27th July, 1948

CONCLUSIONS of the Tenth Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Saturday, 24th July, 1948, at 0900 hours

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Second Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature*)

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Dr. E. Hindle (United Kingdom)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present :

M. J. Aubert (Switzerland)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
M. André Chavan (France)
M. Georges Deflandre (France)
Mme. Marthe Deflandre-Rigaud (France)
Mr. C. F. dos Passos (U.S.A.)
Professor E. Fischer-Piette (France)
M. H. Gisin (Switzerland)
Professor R. Jeannel (France)
Dr. P. Jespersen (Denmark)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Dr. H. H. J. Nesbitt (Canada)
Mr. C. D. Radford (United Kingdom)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)
M. J. Segal (U.S.S.R.)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*
Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer*

Nomenclature of supergeneric groups below family level: communication by Prof. R. Jeannel

1. THE COMMISSION, jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, had under consideration a communication (file Z.N.(S.)357) submitted by Professor R. Jeannel (France) on the subject of the nomenclature of supergeneric groups below the family level[7].

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

that the problem of the nomenclature of supergeneric groups submitted by Professor R. Jeannel should be included among the matters to be dealt with in the Report on the problems arising in connection with Family and Sub-Family names which it had been agreed at the meeting noted in the margin the Secretary to the Commission should be invited to prepare for consideration by the Commission at their meeting to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress.

Nomenclature of families and sub-families: Prof. R. L. Usinger's communication

2. THE COMMISSION, jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, were informed by Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.) that he did not now propose to make the communication (file Z.N.(S.)357), of which he had given notice, for, as this was concerned with the rules governing the nomenclature of families, it could, he thought, better be treated as forming part of the documentation which would form the basis of the Report by the Secretary, to which reference had just been made.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

that the paper on the nomenclature of families and subfamilies by Professor E. Gorton Linsley and Professor Robert L. Usinger which had been received from Professor Usinger should form part of the material to be studied by the Secretary to the Commission in preparing the Report which at the meeting noted in the margin the Commission had asked him to furnish for their consideration at their meeting to be held at the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress.

The concepts "grade" and "pseudo-genus": communication by M. G. Deflandre

3. THE COMMISSION, jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, had under consideration a communication[8] submitted by M. Georges Deflandre (France), in which the applicant asked that the *Règles* should be amended to provide recognition of the concepts " grade " and " pseudo-genus " (file Z.N.(S.)363).

---

[7] For the text of the communication made by Professor Jeannel, see pages 164–165 in Volume 3 of this journal, and for the record of the discussion in the Section on Nomenclature, see pages 28–29 in Volume 5.

[8] For the text of the communication made by M. Deflandre, see page 166 of Volume 3 of this journal, and for the record of the discussion in the Section on Nomenclature, see pages 30–31 in Volume 5.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion* 13)

to take into consideration as soon as possible the proposal that recognition should be given in the *Règles* to the concepts " grade " and " pseudo-genus ".

Fragments (organites and sclerites) of fossil invertebrates : communication by M. G. Deflandre and Mme. M. Deflandre-Rigaud

4. THE COMMISSION, jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, had under consideration a communication submitted by M. Georges Deflandre and Mme. Marthe Deflandre Rigaud (France)[9], in which the applicants asked that the *Règles* should be amended so as to recognise a new system of terminology—the terms concerned to be those used in the Roman military hierarchy—for use for fragments (organites and sclerites) of certain fossil invertebrates (file Z.N.(S.)364).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion* 14)

to take into consideration as soon as possible the proposal that recognition should be given in the *Règles* for a new system of terminology for use for fragments (organites and sclerites) of certain fossil invertebrates.

Arachnid names published in Clerck, 1757 : proposal to make available : preliminary discussion

5. THE COMMISSION, jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, had under consideration a communication submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France)[10] and similar communications received from M. Maurice Thomas (Belgium), in which the applicants asked that the Commission should make available nomenclatorially the generic name *Araneus* and the trivial names published for certain Arachnid species by Clerck in his *Aranei svecici*, notwithstanding the fact that those names were published in 1757, i.e. prior to the date prescribed as the starting point of zoological nomenclature in Article 26 of the *Règles* (file Z.N.(S.)238).

PROFESSOR PIERRE BONNET (FRANCE) said that the proposal which he laid before the Commission was one of the utmost importance in the study of Arachnology. That proposal aimed at securing an exception to the provisions of Article 26 in favour of the Arachnid names published by Clerck in 1757, the year prior to the starting point of zoological nomenclature as prescribed by that Article. The precise form of the method to be adopted to secure this end was of indifference to himself and was primarily a matter for the Commission to determine. What was essential was to provide authority for the use of the names published by Clerck, for these names were used by the great majority of Arachnologists, and great confusion would result if an attempt were made to apply to the species concerned the later names properly applicable thereto under the *Règles*. In many cases it was a matter of doubt what were the alternative names which should strictly be used, and in consequence the small minority of specialists who did not use the Clerckian names had found it necessary to cite not only the names which they believed to be the correct names under the *Règles* but also the corresponding Clerckian names, as it was only by so doing that they could ensure that Arachnologists reading their works would understand to which species they were referring. The 54 species named by Clerck were the commonest European species and prior to the adoption of the *Règles* the great majority of these names had been in universal use. It had been a grave error on the part of the authors of the *Règles* not to provide an exception in Article 26 in favour of the Clerckian names, notwithstanding the fact that they had been published one year prior to the date selected in the *Règles* as the starting point of zoological nomenclature. The application now submitted to the Commission in favour of action which would render the Clerckian names available was based upon a consultation which had been carried out with the 62 specialists in different parts of the world who today constituted the entire body of workers in the field in question. Of these specialists 54 had furnished statements of their views: 48 of these specialists had expressed themselves as being in favour of the present petition; 4 were opposed to it; 2 had considered themselves not sufficiently experienced to justify them in expressing an opinion. Of the 8 specialists who had not replied, 6 were nationals of countries with which for political reasons communication was difficult and their silence should certainly not be interpreted as indicating a desire on their part to abstain from voting on the present application. It would be seen therefore that there was an overwhelming consensus of opinion on the part of interested specialists in favour of the present application. In returning a favourable reply to the present application, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature would give much satisfaction to the great majority of the specialists interested in this group who already used the names published by Clerck and were anxious that this usage should now be officially approved. Such a decision would give satisfaction also to almost all of the small minority who did not at present use the Clerckian names but who had expressed themselves as most anxious to do so, if official approval were to be given to this course. The grant of the present application by the Commission would confer a signal benefit on the nomenclature of Arachnology and would redound greatly to the honour of the nomenclaturists of 1948.

---

[9] For the text of the communication made by M. and Mme. Deflandre, see page 167 of Volume 3 of this journal, and for the record of the discussion in the Section on Nomenclature, see pages 31–32 of Volume 5.

[10] For the text of the communication made by Professor Bonnet, see pages 173-176 of Volume 3, and for the record of the discussion in the Section on Nomenclature, see pages 33-35 of Volume 5.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the subject matter of the present application had constituted a serious problem in the group concerned long before the present *Règles* were adopted. It had not been found possible in the *Règles* to provide an exception in favour of Clerck's Arachnid names and in consequence it had not been possible to make any progress in this matter in the period between 1901, the year in which the *Règles* were adopted, and the year 1913, when the Congress had granted plenary powers to the Commission to suspend the *Règles* in cases where they were satisfied that greater confusion than uniformity would otherwise ensue. It was unfortunate that this case, which was admitted by all to be one of great importance to specialists in the group concerned had not long ago formed the subject of an application for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers. The long delay which had occurred in submitting such a request naturally made the problem more difficult of solution. Moreover, if the Commission were now to find it possible to grant the request submitted, they would equally have been able to so do thirty years before. Thus, the delay had caused also quite unnecessary inconvenience to all students of the group concerned and the expenditure of much unnecessary time on discussion of a question which could readily have been settled in one sense or another a generation earlier.

Continuing, the Acting President said that, in view of the exceptional interest of this case and of the special features which it presented, he considered that the best course would be to defer its further consideration until a later meeting of the Commission, in order to allow everyone who had heard Professor Bonnet's presentation of the case to consider the issues involved. He accordingly proposed that this application should be considered at a later meeting of the Commission to be held jointly with the Section on Nomenclature. In the meanwhile, he proposed to hand the dossier relating to this case to Professor di Caporiacco, whom he would call upon to make a further explanatory statement at the opening of the meeting when this matter was next considered.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 10)

to defer further consideration of the application that they should use their plenary powers to make available nomenclatorially the names published for certain taxonomic units in the Class Arachnida by Clerck in 1757, prior to the date fixed by Article 26 of the *Règles* as the starting point of zoological nomenclature until a later meeting to be held jointly with the Section on Nomenclature on Monday, 26th July, 1948.

Report to be submitted by the Commission to the Congress on the work performed during its Paris Session

6. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had originally expected that it would be necessary to ask the Commission, as also the Section on Nomenclature, to meet again that afternoon and perhaps also in the evening. Both the Commission and the Section had, however, made such good progress in the consideration of the matters requiring their attention that it would not now be necessary to ask either body to meet again before the weekend. That this should be so would, he felt sure, be welcomed by the members of the Commission and the Section, some of whom, no doubt, desired to attend the function organised for that afternoon by the authorities of the Congress. A day and a half's break in the meetings of the Commission would also be most valuable to himself (the Acting President), for it would provide him with an opportunity to prepare the draft of the Report to be submitted by the Commission to the Congress on their work during their Paris Session, which, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, it was his duty to prepare for the consideration of the Commission. He proposed that, as on former occasions, the first part of the Report should be devoted to giving a succinct account of matters relating to the work and personnel of the Commission which had been dealt with since the last meeting of the Congress, including particulars in regard to such matters as changes in the membership of the Commission, together with the proposals of the Commission for the filling of certain of its offices which would fall vacant at the close of the present Congress, and for the filling of vacancies in the membership of the Commission arising from the completion of the term of service of the Class 1949. Second, he proposed that the Report should set out the proposals of the Commission for the reform of their composition and of their procedure and matters connected therewith. Finally the Report should deal with the question of the reforms which it had been agreed to recommend should be made in the *Règles*. It would not be necessary to refer in detail to the numerous minor changes which it had been agreed to recommend, for these had all been agreed with the Section on Nomenclature, to which, jointly with the Commission, the Congress looked for advice in such matters. It was however, desirable that the Report should give a general picture of the reforms proposed and in particular that it should refer specifically to the more important features of those reforms.

Turning to the question of the procedure to be adopted in considering the draft Report, the Acting President recalled that the following Monday, 26th July, 1948, was the last day on which it would be possible to hold meetings of the Commission and the Section prior to the final *Concilium Plenum* of the Congress to be held on the morning of the following day, Tuesday, 27th July. In spite of the excellent progress made by the Commission and the Section during the past week, there still remained a large amount of work to be despatched if the full programme was to be carried through to a successful issue. It was essential therefore that the best possible use should be made of the limited amount of working time which still remained. To this end, he (the Acting President) suggested that the draft of the Commission's Report should be considered first at a meeting to be held jointly between the Commission and the Section on Nomenclature on the morning of Monday, 26th July. This procedure would have the advantage that, while affording the Commission the fullest opportunity for considering the document submitted for their consideration, it would also enable them to obtain the views and advice of the members of the Section on Nomenclature at a stage when their Report was still in draft and changes in wording and emphasis could be made in a way which would not be possible—except with considerable difficulty—if the Report were to be formally adopted by the Commission prior to its being brought before the Section. Under the procedure suggested the Commission would be able to make any changes in the draft Report which they might consider desirable and at the same time to incorporate in that document any suggestions for its improvement which might have been made during the joint consideration of the draft with the members of the Section. It should be possible in this way to secure the fullest agreement between the Commission and the Section on the Report to be submitted to the Congress and to do so in the promptest and most businesslike manner. At the present stage of the Congress this latter consideration was of great importance, in view of the large number of individual problems of nomenclature still awaiting decision.

THE COMMISSION took note of, and approved, the proposals submitted by the Acting President in regard to the procedure to be adopted in the preparation, and subsequent consideration, of the Report to be submitted to the Congress.

Eleventh Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session: date and time noted

7. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) then proposed that the Commission should adjourn for the day. As already announced, the next meeting of the Commission, which, like the present meeting, would be held concurrently with a meeting of the Section, on Nomenclature, would take place on Monday, 26th July, 1948. The meeting would start at 0900 hours.

THE COMMISSION took note of the above arrangements.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned at* 1210 *hours*).

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 21st-27th July, 1948.

CONCLUSIONS of the Eleventh Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July, 1948, at 0930 hours.

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Third Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature.*)

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Dr. E. Hindle (United Kingdom)
Professor A. R. Jorge (Portugal)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Professor K. Mansour (Egypt)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor R. Spärck (Denmark)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present :

Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
M. André Chavan (France)
Mr. C. F. dos Passos (U.S.A.)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)
Signor Antonio Valle (Italy)
Mr. R. Winckworth (United Kingdom)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*

Apology by the Acting President for late arrival

1. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) apologised for having kept the meeting waiting. The reason, as the Commission appreciated, was that, although ever since the close of the meeting on Saturday he had been engaged continuously on work in connection with today's meetings of the Commission and the Section on Nomenclature, he had only just completed the preparations necessary for that purpose.

Programme for the meetings to be held during the day

2. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) outlined the procedure which he proposed for the meetings to be held that day. In spite of the excellent progress made at the meetings held during the previous week, there remained a large number of matters awaiting the attention of the Commission. These included a considerable number of further proposals for the improvement of the *Règles* and also a large number of applications relating to individual problems of nomenclature which had been submitted to the Commission for decision. It was important that decisions should be taken on as many as possible of these applications: first, because the applicants concerned, many of whom—owing to the war and other causes—had been waiting for a decision for a number of years, were most anxious to secure a settlement of the problems which they had submitted to the Commission, second, because it was important that the Commission should decide as many of these cases as possible without further delay, in order to demonstrate to zoologists generally that they were capable of reaching definite decisions on cases which had been carefully prepared and properly submitted.

Continuing, the Acting President said that it would be necessary for the Commission—as also the Section on Nomenclature—to devote to the purpose the whole of the present day and in addition probably to meet again in the evening after dinner. All the meetings to be held that day would, like the present meeting, be concurrent meetings of the Commission and the Section on Nomenclature. This procedure would enable the Commission to reach decisions on the matters awaiting their attention in the presence of the members of the Section and with the assistance and advice of any members of the Section who might desire to take part in these discussions. Under this procedure, it would be possible to report to the Section recommendations agreed upon by the Commission directly they had been formulated. He proposed therefore from time to time to adjourn the meeting of the Commission, to enable him, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, to report to the Section recommendations and conclusions reached by the Commission.

THE COMMISSION :—

> took note of the programme outlined by the Acting President and approved the proposals which he had submitted in regard to the procedure to be adopted.

Election of Professor K. Mansour (Egypt) to be an Alternate Member of the Commission for the duration of the Paris Session

3. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reported that, in accordance with the arrangement made at the first meeting of the Commission during its present Session, Professor K. Mansour (Egypt) had been invited to serve as an Alternate Member of the Commission during the present (Paris) Session of meetings, *vice* Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) who was unable to be present. This invitation had been accepted by Professor Mansour.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 1st Meeting, Conclusion* 6(2))

THE COMMISSION :—

took note of the above statement and welcomed Professor Mansour to their table.

(*The election of Professor K. Mansour to be an Alternate Member of the Commission was thereupon reported to the Section on Nomenclature*).

Withdrawal of Professor R. Spärck and nomination of Dr. H. Lemche as prospective Danish member of the Commission

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion,* 17(3))

4. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had to report that, much, as he felt sure, to the regret of all members of the Commission, Professor R. Spärck (Denmark) had intimated that on reflection he felt that pressure of his other duties, especially duties in connection with the next meeting of the Congress, would make it preferable that some other Danish zoologist should be nominated to be the Danish member of the Commission in succession to Dr. Th. Mortensen, whose resignation on grounds of ill-health had caused such regret to all members of the Commission. Discussions on this question had accordingly been held between the Danish zoologists present at the Congress, who had recommended that the vacancy caused by the withdrawal of Professor Spärck should be filled by the election of Dr. Henning Lemche. Dr. Lemche was well known to the members of the Commission not only through his published work but also on account of his active participation both in the public meetings of the Commission and in the meetings of the Section on Nomenclature during the present Congress.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note with regret that on account of pressure of other work Professor R. Spärck (Denmark) had felt bound to ask for permission to withdraw his acceptance of nomination as the Danish member of the Commission in succession to Dr. Th. Mortensen (resigned on account of ill-health);

(2) agreed to nominate Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) to be the Danish member of the Commission as from the close of the Paris Congress in succession

to Commissioner Th. Mortensen (resigned) and to appoint Dr. Lemche to be an Alternate Member of the Commission for the remainder of the Paris Session *vice* Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) who had been unable to attend that Session.

(*Dr. Lemche thereupon took his place as an Alternate Member of the Commission.*)

(*The Nomination of Dr. Lemche to be a member of the Commission in succession to Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark) vice Professor R. Spärck (withdrawn) was thereupon reported to the Section on Nomenclature.*)

Report to be submitted by the Commission to the Congress: detailed examination of draft proposed

(*Previous reference: Paris Session,* 10*th Meeting, Conclusion* 6)

5. THE COMMISSION then turned to consider the draft of the Report to be submitted by them to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at its final Plenary Session to be held on the following day (Tuesday, 27th July, 1948) (Commission Paper I.C.(48) 20), which, as arranged at the meeting noted in the margin, had been prepared for their consideration by their Secretary, Commissioner Francis Hemming.

After having satisfied themselves regarding the general scope and form of the proposed Report, THE COMMISSION, in conjunction with the Section on Nomenclature, examined the draft Report, paragraph by paragraph. In the course of this examination, THE COMMISSION, in agreement with the Section, signified their intention to make the undermentioned changes in the following paragraphs of the proposed Report —

Danish representation on the Commission and the arrangements proposed to be adopted in place of the system of three nine-year Classes in the membership of the Commission
Previous references: Paris Session, 11*th Meeting, Conclusion* 4; 3*rd Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

(1) *Paragraphs* 17 *and* 19.—These pargaraphs would need to be amended (*a*) to take account of the changes in the arrangements for Danish representation on the Commission which had just been agreed upon, and (*b*) to indicate (in the second of these paragraphs) the revised arrangements which, at the meeting noted in the margin, it had been agreed to substitute for the existing system by which the membership of the Commission was divided into three 9-year Classes;

Proposed " Official List " of names of species: title to be changed
(*Previous reference: Paris Session,* 9*th Meeting, Conclusion* 42)

(2) *Paragraphs* 44 *and* 45.—It was desirable that these two paragraphs, of which the first was concerned with the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " and the second with the " Official List of Specific Names in Zoology," should be drafted in similar terms. Paragraph 45 should therefore be redrafted to correspond with paragraph 44. It was desirable to indicate the types of name which it was proposed should be placed on the new " Official List " and also to emphasise that the names to be

standardised in that "Official List" were the trivial names comprised in the specific names concerned, and to make it clear that, although the generic name with which any such trivial name was originally published must necessarily be included in the "Official List," such inclusion did not confer any status on the binominal combination in which that trivial name had originally been published or imply any view on the taxonomic question of the genus to which the species so named should be referred. For this purpose, it was desirable that the title of this "Official List" should be changed from the "Official List of Specific Names in Zoology" to the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology." It was desirable that an explanation on the foregoing lines regarding the scope of this "Official List" should be prefixed to this "List" when it was published. These points should be made clear in the revised draft of paragraph 45.

Verification of text of revised "Règles": an *ad hoc* Editorial Committee substituted for the Executive Committee of the Commission

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 12)

(3) *Paragraph* 47.—It was felt that, although this paragraph, as drafted, correctly represented both the recommendation which the Commission had submitted to the Section on Nomenclature regarding the procedure to be adopted after the Congress for seeing the revised text of the *Règles* through the press and also the conclusion thereon reached by the Section, the subject was of such great importance that it was desirable, if possible, to strengthen the arrangements that had been proposed. It was suggested that this end would be achieved if the duty of making a close examination of the draft text of the *Règles* prepared by the jurists were entrusted not to the Executive Committee of the Commission (as hitherto proposed) but to a specially appointed *ad hoc* Editorial Committee composed of three members (or Alternate Members) of the Commission who had been present throughout the discussions held in Paris. The duties involved were heavy, and it was felt that they could better be discharged by such a body than by the Executive Committee of the Commission, only one of the three members of which had been present at the Paris Congress. It was agreed that the change suggested was an improvement over the arrangement hitherto contemplated and that paragraph 47 should be redrafted accordingly. As regards the composition of the proposed *ad hoc* Editorial Committee, it was felt that a decision should be postponed until later in the day

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion* 62)

in order to permit of informal consultations for the purpose of bringing forward a proposal which would be generally acceptable.

At the close of the foregoing discussion, attention was drawn to the fact that, as the Commission was to sit continuously throughout the day, it might happen that they would wish to make some addition to their Report in the light of the further business which they would then have transacted. While it was agreed that it was desirable that the Commission should at once seek the approval of the Section on Nomenclature for their Report, that approval should be sought on two understandings. The first of these understandings related to the scope of the approval given by the Section to miscellaneous amendments of, and changes in, the *Règles*. The Report, as drafted, covered all such amendments or changes as had already been approved by the Commission and confirmed by the Section. In addition, however, there were other proposals for amendments and changes in the *Règles* awaiting consideration by the Commission and the Section. The reference in the Report to the approval of miscellaneous amendments of, and changes in, the *Règles* was therefore to be understood as applying not only to the amendments and changes already approved but also to any other such amendments or changes as might be approved by the Commission and confirmed by the Section either later during the present meeting or at meetings to be held later during the present day. Second, it must be understood that, if subsequent to the adoption of the Report by the Commission and of its approval by the Section, the Commission desired to include in the Report references to other decisions taken later in the day, they should be free to do so, provided that in every such case they obtained the approval of the Section for the insertion in the Report of the passage concerned.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) in the light of the discussion held jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, recorded above, to modify as follows the under-mentioned recommendations previously adopted, that is to say :—

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 42)

(a) to substitute for the recommendation agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, that the new " Official List " of the names of species should be given the title " Official List of Specific Names in Zoology ", the recommendation that the title to be given to this " Official List " should be the

"Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 12)

(b) to substitute for the recommendation agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, that the duty of examining the draft text of the *Règles* revised in accordance with the decisions of the Paris Congress, when that draft text was received from the jurists, should be entrusted to the Executive Committee of the Commission, the recommendation that this duty should be entrusted to an *ad hoc* Editorial Committee of three Members or Alternate Members of the Commission who had been present throughout the discussions held during the Paris Congress;

(2) that, subject (a) to the incorporation in the paragraphs numbered 17 and 19 in the draft (relating to the Danish representation on the Commission and to the arrangements proposed to be adopted in place of the system of three 9-year Classes in which the membership of the Commission was at present divided) of the corrections noted in the discussion recorded above, and (b) to the redrafting of the paragraphs numbered 45 and 47 in the draft (relating respectively to the new "Official List" of the names of species and to the body to which should be entrusted the duty of examining the revised draft of the *Règles*, when received from the jurists) to conform with the conclusions respectively recorded in regard thereto in (1)(a) and (1)(b) above and subject also to the incorporation in the first of these paragraphs of the drafting amendments agreed upon in the discussion with the Section on Nomenclature recorded above, the draft Report prepared by Secretary Hemming (Commission Paper I.C.(48)20) gave full effect to the conclusions reached by the Commission during their Paris Session and to the action taken thereon by the Section on Nomenclature, and that a Report in these terms would provide the Congress with all the data required to enable it to judge of the results achieved during the present Session;

(3) with reference to (1)(b) above, to request the Acting President to confer with leading European and American zoologists present at the Congress on the question of the composition of the *ad hoc*

Editorial Committee and to submit recommendations in regard thereto at a later meeting to be held in the course of the same day.

Unanimous adoption by the Commission of its Report to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology

6. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to adopt as their unanimous Report to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology the draft prepared by Secretary Hemming (Commission Paper I.C.(48)20), subject to the incorporation therein of the drafting and other changes specified in Conclusion 5 above ;

(2) to authorise and request Commissioner Hemming, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, to sign their Report, in the form unanimously approved and adopted in (1) above, and to submit it on their behalf to the Section on Nomenclature, with a recommendation that the Section :—

(a) approve and adopt each and all of the individual recommendations submitted in the Report ;

(b) agree :—

(i) that their approval to the passage relating to the adoption of miscellaneous amendments of, or changes in, the *Règles* should be understood as applying not only to such amendments and changes as had already been approved but also to any other such amendments or changes as might be adopted by the Commission and confirmed by the Section either later during the present meeting or at other meetings held later during the day ;

(ii) that if, as the result of further discussions either later during the present meeting or at other meetings held later during the day, the Commission desired to insert additional passages in their Report, they should be free so to do, provided that in each case they first obtained the concurrence of the Section for the addition so proposed to be made and that, on any such addition being so approved, Commissioner Hemming, as Secretary to the Commission, should be authorised and requested to incorporate the addition in question, before the Commission's Report was submitted to the Congress at the Plenary Session to be held on the following day (Tuesday, 27th July, 1948);

(c) approve the Commission's Report as a whole, subject to the understandings specified in (a) and (b) above, and should authorise and request Mr. Hemming, as Secretary to the Commission, to submit that Report to the Congress at the Plenary Session to be held on the following day and, in doing so, to inform the Congress that the Report had been unanimously approved and adopted by the Commission, by whom it had been submitted to the Section on Nomenclature, by whom in turn it had been unanimously approved and adopted.

(*The Report of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature was thereupon submitted to the Section on Nomenclature for approval.*[11])

Miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the "Règles": Fourth Instalment
(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 1)

7. THE COMMISSION had before them a memorandum by the Secretary (Commission Paper I.C.(48)16), containing a fourth instalment of miscellaneous proposals for the amendment and clarification of the *Règles*. For convenience of reference these proposals, which were seventeen in number, had been numbered consecutively with the proposals brought forward in the paper containing the third instalment (Commission Paper I.C.(48)15). The present proposals were therefore numbered (64) to (80).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to examine Commission Paper I.C.(48)16, point by point, for the purpose of reaching conclusions regarding the recommendations to be submitted on the questions raised therein.

Article 32 (suggested amendment to provide for the rejection of trivial names on grounds of inappropriateness in certain cases)

8. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by Mr. Philip P. Graves (Eire) (file Z.N.(S.) 205) that Article 32 should be amended so as to provide for the rejection of trivial names in certain cases on the ground that those names were totally inappropriate, having been selected by the original author as the result of a misapprehension on a question of fact (e.g. where a butterfly occurring only in the Philippine Islands was named

---

[11] For the record of the approval of the Commission's Report by the Section on Nomenclature, see page 89 of Volume 5.

californica by a credulous systematist who purchased an example labelled "California"), together with a note on the foregoing proposal submitted by the Secretary in Point (64) in Commission Paper I.C.(48) 16.

The view was expressed in the discussion on this proposal that, although at first sight this appeared a logical and desirable proposal, it was in fact one which contained a considerable element of danger. If Article 32 were to be relaxed in the manner suggested, it might lead to considerable instability in the case of trivial names based upon the names of countries, for it might lead to numerous requests for changes in such names, where, as the result of political changes, there were changes in the status of countries or parts of countries or changes in the names by which countries were known.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to reject the proposal that express provision should be made in Article 32 for the rejection in certain circumstances of trivial names on the ground of inappropriateness.

"Opinion" 124 : extension to cover certain terms intermediate between generic and trivial names published by Hübner (J.)

(*Previous reference : Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 40)

9. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(*a*) a proposal submitted by Dr. R. Ferreira d'Almeida and Dr. José Oiticica Filho (Brazil) that in the case of names of species of the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta) published by Hübner (J.) in volume 1 of his *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* in (apparently) trinominal form, as (for example) the name *Princeps dominans capys*, the trivial name (*capys*) should be accepted for nomenclatorial purposes but not either of the other names (i.e. in the example cited, the names *Princeps* and *dominans*) (file Z.N.(S.) 218) ;

(*b*) a letter addressed to Dr. Ferreira d'Almeida by Professor Charles D. Michener (U.S.A.) concurring in the proposal that in the case of names of the kind discussed in (*a*) above the intermediate term (for example, *dominans*) should be rejected and that the third term (for example, *capys*) should be accepted, but expressing the view that it would not be reasonable to exclude the first term (*Princeps*) from nomenclatorial availability as well as the second (file Z.N.(S.) 218) ;

(*c*) a proposal, that in the case of the names in question the intermediate terms (in the present example, the term *dominans*) should be rejected as not of subgeneric status by an extension to these terms of the decision given by the Commission in *Opinion* 124 in regard to somewhat similar intermediate terms published by Linnaeus in 1758 in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* for species belonging to the same Order of the Class Insecta, submitted by the Secretary in Point (65) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (Mr. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the above system of nomenclature had been employed by Hübner not only in the *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* but also in the *Systematisch-alphabetisches Verzeichniss*, published in 1822. Whatever decision was taken should apply to both works.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, where in volume 1 of the work *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* or in the *Systematisch-alphabetisches Verzeichniss*, Hübner (J.) cited a species under a name having an apparently trinominal form (e.g. the name *Princeps dominans capys*), the generic name (*Princeps*) and the specific trivial name (*capys*) are to be accepted as satisfying the requirements of Article 25 of the *Règles* but that the intermediate term (*dominans*) is not to be treated as having acquired the status of a subgeneric name by virtue of having been so published ;

(2) to render an *Opinion*, supplementary to *Opinion* 124, embodying the decision specified in (1) above.

Addition to the "Règles" of a provision defining the functions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

10. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.) 352) that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* defining the functions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, submitted by the Secretary in Point (66) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

In the foregoing paper the Secretary reminded the Commission that, among the provisions which, on the proposal of the Commission, the Section on Nomenclature had agreed to recommend the Congress to add to the *Règles*, were several provisions entrusting special duties to the Commission. In these circumstances, it was necessary that there should be inserted in the *Règles* a provision defining the functions of the Commission, for it would not be either logical or practicable to include in the *Règles* provisions conferring special duties upon the Commission without having first defined generally the functions of that body.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (Mr. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the functions enumerated in Point (66) were all functions already entrusted to the Commission before the opening of the present Congress. To these must be added the function in regard to the rendering of *Declarations* on a new basis which has been agreed upon during the present Congress.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* defining the functions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the following lines :—

(*a*) The centralisation, discussion and elaboration of all questions relating to zoological nomenclature are entrusted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), which is charged with the following duties, in addition to such other duties as are prescribed elsewhere in these *Règles* :—

(1) the submission, as may be required, to the International Congress of Zoology (hereinafter referred to as the "Congress") of recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, or for the insertion of additional provisions in, the *Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique* (hereinafter referred to as the "*Règles*"), where, in its opinion, such amendments, clarifications or additions are required ;

(*Later reference Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion 16*)

(2) the preliminary consideration, on behalf of the Congress, for such a period, not exceeding one year, as in any given case the Commission may decide, of every proposition relating to a proposed change in the *Règles* which may be submitted to the Congress from any source ;

(*Previous references Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 9*)

(3) the rendering, during periods between successive Congresses, of *Declarations* embodying recommendations for changes in the *Règles* adopted by the Commission under (1) above in respect of proposals dealt with by the Commission during such periods ;

(4) the rendering of *Opinions* on questions of zoological nomenclature submitted to the Commission, the decisions embodied in which to become operative immediately upon the *Opinion* in question being so rendered, without further reference to the Congress ;

(5) the compilation of the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " and the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " and of the Official Indexes of Rejected and Invalid Names and the rendering of *Opinions* in regard thereto ;

(6) such other functions as have been, or may be, agreed upon by the present Congress ;

(b) The Commission possesses also plenary powers to suspend, in whole or in part, any Article of these *Règles*, other than the present Article, as applied to the names in any book or to any individual name, where, in its opinion, . . . (here should be inserted the provisions in regard to the use by the Commission of its plenary powers as agreed upon by the Ninth International Congress of Zoology at Monaco in 1913, as amended by the present (Paris) Congress, together with all other provisions relating to the plenary powers agreed upon by the present (Paris) Congress.).

Article 25 (status of a holotype or lectotype in relation to an inadequate original description)

11. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)291) submitted by Dr. C. A. Hoare (London) that Article 25 should be clarified to indicate whether, where the original description of a species is poor and the identification of the species named therefore either difficult or uncertain—the case cited was that of *Trypanosoma suis* Ochmann, 1905—the type specimen, if available, can be called in aid to supplement the published description. At the same time, the Commission had under consideration a proposal in regard to this question submitted by the Secretary in Point (67) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

It was pointed out in discussion that Article 25 was concerned only with the nomenclatorial status of names ; for the purpose of that Article the taxonomic application of a name was irrelevant. The question of the taxonomic species to which should be applicable a specific name (published in conditions which satisfied Article 25) when there

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

existed a recognisable type specimen (holotype or lectotype) had been settled in connection with the amplification of Article 31 agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that in the forthcoming revision of the *Règles* a clear distinction should be drawn between (1) the question whether a given specific name was an available name in the sense that it possessed rights under the Law of Priority and (2) the question of the taxonomic unit to which any given specific name was to be treated as adhering, the first of these questions depending upon whether the name in question satisfied the requirements specified in Article 25, while the second was a matter to be determined in accordance with the rules laid down in Article 31.

Article 25 (priority to be accorded to a name in a work issued in instalments where that name is published on one date and the relevant description or part of it on a later date) : supplementary decision

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 20)

12. THE COMMISSION reviewed the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin regarding the priority to be accorded to a specific or generic name where that name is published on one date and the description or part of the description relating thereto is published on a later date, in the light of a note submitted by the Secretary in Point (68) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14. In this note the Secretary pointed out that special provisions of a rather more stringent character needed to be adopted in the case of generic names published after 31st December, 1930 (i.e. after Proviso (c) to Article 25 became operative) since, as regards these names, it was essential to make it clear that no name was to be accepted as having satisfied the requirements of the foregoing Article until a clear designation of its type species had been published.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the provision which it had been agreed at the Seventh Meeting of their Paris Session (Conclusion 20) should be added to Article 25, to make it clear that, where, in the case of a generic name published subsequent to 31st December, 1930, the description of the genus so named is published in two successive portions of a book or serial published in instalments, such a name is to rank for purposes of priority only as from the later of the instalments concerned, if the designation of the type species of the genus is not included in the earlier published of the instalments concerned.

The expressions " grade " and " pseudo-genus " : proposed recognition of, in the " Règles " : rejection of proposal

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 10th Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

13. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)363) submitted by M. Georges Deflandre (France) that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles*, recognising the categories " grade " and " pseudo-genus," together with a summary of a note thereon, submitted by the Secretary in Point (69) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, while the expressions " grade " and " pseudo-genus " had been found convenient by some palaeozoologists for certain taxonomic purposes,

those expressions were to be regarded as technical terms only and, as such, fell outside the scope of zoological nomenclature ;

(2) that, in view of (1) above, it would be inappropriate to include definitions of the foregoing expressions in the *Règles;*

(3) to render a *Declaration* recording the foregoing decision.

Proposed new system of nomenclature for fragments of fossil invertebrates found in sedimentary rocks : rejection of proposal

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 10th Meeting, Conclusion 4*)

14. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)364) submitted by M. Georges Deflandre and Mme. Marthe Deflandre-Rigaud (France) that provisions should be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing a special system of nomenclature to be applied only to certain fragments (organites and sclerites) of fossil invertebrates found in sedimentary rocks, together with the summary of a note thereon, submitted by the Secretary in Point (70) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, while for certain purposes palaezoologists might require to make use of a special system of terminology for denoting certain fragments, such as organites and sclerites, of fossil species of invertebrates found in sedimentary rocks where the fragments in question were not sufficient to form the basis of a taxonomic unit of a category recognised in zoological nomenclature, the expressions employed to denote such fragments were to be regarded as technical terms and not as zoological names and as such fell outside the scope of zoological nomenclature ;

(2) that, in view of (1) above, it would be inappropriate to include in the *Règles* provisions specifying and defining the terms to be used for the foregoing purposes and therefore that no term so published was to be recognised as having any status in zoological nomenclature ;

(3) to render a *Declaration* recording the foregoing decision.

Status of interpretations of the " Règles " given in " Declarations " rendered by the Commission in periods between successive Congresses

15. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* defining the status of interpretations of the *Règles* given by the Commission in *Declarations* rendered by the Commission in periods between successive Congresses, submitted by the Secretary in Point (71) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 9, *and* 11*th Meeting, Conclusion* 10)

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that an Article should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that when, during a period between successive Congresses, the Commission give an interpretation of the *Règles* in a *Declaration*, the interpretation so given is to become operative immediately upon the publication of the said *Declaration* and is, until the next meeting of the Congress, to have like force and vigour as though it had already been embodied in the *Règles*, and that the proposed amendment or clarification of, or addition to, the *Règles* specified in the said *Declaration* shall be considered by the Section on Nomenclature at the next meeting of the Congress, with a view to the submission thereby of a recommendation to the Congress that the *Règles* should be amended, clarified or extended in the manner indicated in the *Declaration* in question.

Method to be followed in amending the "Règles": insertion in the "Règles" of a provision regarding

16. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing the manner by which alone changes can be made in the *Règles*, submitted by the Secretary in Point (72) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that an Article should be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing that no amendment in, clarification of, or addition to, the *Règles* may be made by the Congress, save on the recommendation of the Section on Nomenclature at Congresses where such a Section is established and in other cases on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature but that in the former case no such recommendation may be submitted by the Section on Nomenclature, unless the proposal that the *Règles* should be amended, clarified or extended in the manner proposed has been submitted to the Commission for a period of one year prior to the opening of the Congress or for such less time as in any given case the Commission may agree is sufficient and the Commission has submitted to the Section a recommendation as to the action desirable on the said proposal.

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 11*th Meeting, Conclusion* 10(*a*)(2))

Article 35 (polymorphism in trivial names arising from the use of the same

17. THE COMMISSION reviewed the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin to recommend the insertion in the *Règles* of a *Recommandation* urging authors to avoid publishing as the trivial name of a species a

word in noun and adjectival form): addition of a further example in "Recommandation"

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion 3)

compound word having as its termination a word in noun form (e.g. *-costa*) where a similar compound word having as its termination the same word in adjectival form (e.g. *-costatus* or *-costata*) has already been published as the trivial name of another species in the same or an allied genus, and in this connection had under consideration a supplementary proposal submitted by the Secretary in Point (73) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that the example afforded by the use of the noun-form "*cauda*" and the adjective-form "*caudatus, -a, -um*", should be added to the *Recommandation* which, at the meeting noted in the margin, it had been agreed to recommend should be added to the *Règles* regarding the need for avoiding, so far as possible, the use in the same or allied genera of compound trivial names differing from one another solely through having as their respective terminations the same words in noun-form or adjective-form or *vice versa*.

Article embodying the plenary powers of the Commission: drafting amendment

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion 7)

18. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a note submitted by the Secretary in Point (74) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16, drawing attention to the inadvertent inclusion in paragraph 6(2)(a) of Commission Paper I.C.(48)4, of a recommendation that, when the Plenary Powers Resolution of 1913 (*Declaration* 5) was embodied in an Article of the *Règles*, there should be embodied at the same time the fourth of the four Articles of which the foregoing Resolution was composed, this Article being concerned with a matter of great importance (collaboration between the Commission and groups of specialists), which, however, it would be inappropriate to deal with in the proposed Article.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that the fourth of the four Articles which together constituted the Plenary Powers Resolution of 1913 should not be embodied in the Article which, at the meeting noted in the margin, it had been agreed to recommend should be inserted as a new Article of the *Règles*.

Neotypes (erroneous statements regarding, deleted from "Opinion" 126)

19. THE COMMISSION had under consideration certain unfortunate *obiter dicta* included in *Opinion* 126 (relating to the status of new names in d'Orbigny's *Prodrome*), which were so drafted as to give the misleading impression that the Commission had already given a ruling on the status of neotypes, together with a proposal in regard thereto submitted by the Secretary in Point (75) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the decision in regard to the status of new names published in d'Orbigny's *Prodrome* of 1850 (i.e. that the specific names published in the above work are available under the *Règles*, when accompanied by a description or indication) given in the " summary " to *Opinion* 126, should be incorporated in the appropriate schedule to the *Règles* ;

(2) in order to remove such misunderstandings as had arisen, expressly to place on record that, as in the case of other *Opinions*, the decision taken by the Commission in *Opinion* 126 was to be looked for only in the " summary " of that *Opinion* and that no observation contained in the body of *Opinion* 126 but not included in the " summary " thereof was to be regarded as recording a decision by the Commission as respects either the interpretation of the *Règles* or any other matter.

Article 8 (addition to be made to Section (*b*) of the second of the existing " Recommandations " prior to its incorporation in the " Règles " as a mandatory provision)
(*Previous references: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusions* 37 *and* 15)

20. THE COMMISSION reviewed, in the light of a recommendation submitted by the Secretary in Point (76) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16, the recommendation which, at the meeting noted in the margin, it had been agreed to submit regarding the amendment of item (b) of the second of the two *Recommandations* at present attached to Article 8, prior to the incorporation of the provisions of that *Recommandation* in the *Règles* as a mandatory provision.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that the generic name *Stenogyra* should be added as an example of the class of name referred in the first part of the *Recommandation* proposed to be attached to the substantive provision which it had been agreed, at the meeting noted in the margin, should be incorporated in the *Règles* in place of the second of the two existing *Recommandations* to Article 8, item (b); and that the generic names *Hydrophilus* and *Philydrus* should be inserted as examples of the class of name referred to in the second part of the proposed *Recommandation.*

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 37)

Addition of paragraph numbers in the case of composite Articles in the " Règles "

21. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal that reference to Articles of the *Règles* containing more than one paragraph should be facilitated by the allocation to each such paragraph of a serial number, submitted by the Secretary in Point (77) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16. In submitting this recommendation, the Secretary drew attention to the error fallen into by many authors through the lack of such paragraph numbers in the case, for example, of Article 14, where the first paragraph, which grammatically consisted of a single sentence, was divided into three subheads, lettered " a," " b," and " c " respectively, and where the letter " c " had commonly been cited as though it were a designation which governed the whole of the remainder of the Article which in fact consisted of two distinct and entirely independent paragraphs.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that, when the text of the *Règles* was revised in the light of the amendments agreed upon by the present (Paris) Congress, serial numbers should be allotted to each paragraph of any Article consisting of more than one paragraph.

Addition of serial numbers where there is more than one "Recommandation" in any given Article of the " Règles "

22. Arising out of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 20 above, THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that, when the text of the *Règles* was revised in the light of the amendments agreed upon by the present (Paris) Congress, serial numbers should be allotted to *Recommandations* in cases where more than one such *Recommandation* was attached to any given Article.

Subdivision into paragraphs of Articles and " Recommandations " consisting of two or more sentences

23. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal that reference to the Articles of the *Règles* should be simplified by the subdivision into two or more paragraphs of those Articles which at present consisted of two or more sentences, each containing a separate provision, submitted by the Secretary in Point (78) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that, when the text of the *Règles* was revised in the light of the amendments agreed upon by the present (Paris) Congress, any Article and any *Recommandation* which consisted of two or more sentences, each containing a separate provision, should be subdivided into paragraphs, each containing only a single sentence and each serially numbered.

Article 30, Rule (e) (clarification of)

24. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a request received from Mr. R. G. Fennah (Trinidad, B.W.I.) (file Z.N.(S.)236) for an interpretation of the expression " *species inquirenda* " as used in Rule (e) in Article 30 of the *Règles*, together with a note thereon submitted by the Secretary in Point (79) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that the second section (section (β)) of Rule (e) in Article 30 of the *Règles* should be redrafted so as to make it clear that the species there referred to are species, regarding the taxonomic identity of which the author of the genus expressed a doubt at the time of the original publication of the generic name, either because the species concerned was or were unknown to him or because of difficulties in identifying it or them or for any other reason, other than that specified in Section (γ) of the same Rule.

Article 30 (expression to be used to denote a species designated or selected as the type species of a genus)

25. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted by the Secretary in Point (80) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16, that, in view of the widespread use of the expression " genotype " by geneticists in a sense entirely different from that in which that expression had been used in zoological nomenclature, a *Recommandation* should be inserted in Article 30 of the *Règles* urging zoologists to refrain from using that expression when referring to the type species of a genus.

In the discussion on this proposal, the point was made that the expression " genotype " had been used by zoologists to denote the type species of a genus long before it was used by geneticists. If therefore zoologists desired to retain the use of this expression, they would be in a strong position if they were to approach geneticists with a request that some other expression should be adopted in genetics. The general view was against an attempt being made to retain the use of this expression in zoological nomenclature. The expression " genotype," viewed as an attempt to latinise the concept of the type species of a genus, could not be regarded as a success; the expression was consequently far from clear in meaning ; moreover, its use in zoological nomenclature was much less common now than formerly and its elimination would be welcome. The proposal that a *Recommandation* should be inserted in the *Règles* urging authors to abandon the use of this expression accordingly received general support.

At the same time the view was generally expressed that it was desirable not to stop short at giving this negative advice ; it was desirable that zoologists should be given positive advice as to the expression which it was desired should be used to denote the concept in question. The relative merits of a number of expressions, such as " generitype," " generotype," etc., were discussed, but, as the French and French-speaking zoologists present pointed out, all expressions of this kind were unacceptable, since it would be impossible to employ them in the substantive French text of the *Règles*, as, if so used, such expressions would be either incomprehensible or definitely misleading.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that, where in the *Règles* (as in Article 30) or in the Schedules thereto, it was necessary to refer to the concept of " a type species of a genus," the expression " espèce type," and, in the English translation, the expression " type species " should invariably be employed ;

(2) that there should be inserted in Article 30 a *Recommandation* urging zoologists when referring to the concept of the type species of the genus always to employ the expression " espèce type " or " type species " or strictly corresponding expressions in other languages and to refrain from using the expression " genotype " or any other expression for this concept.

(*At this point the recommendations adopted by the Commission in the course of the discussion of Commission Paper I.C.*(48)16 *were reported to the Section on Nomenclature.*)

" Necator " Stiles, 1903 (Class Nematoda), an invalid name inadvertently placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " in " Opinion " 66 : validation of, under the plenary powers

26. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, when, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, he had checked the bibliographical references given in the *Opinions* in which names had been placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " in the course of preparing that " List " for publication, he had found that there were a number of errors in the entries concerned, errors which had led in some cases to erroneous citations of type species and in others to names which were actually invalid being placed on the " List." All these errors would need to be corrected in one way or another before the " List " was published and as many as possible of the cases concerned would be brought before the Commission during its present Session. One of the generic names in question had been referred to in a different connection in an earlier discussion and it would, he felt, be convenient if the Commission were now to consider this case (file Z.N.(S.)366).

Continuing, the Acting President said that the name in question was *Necator* Stiles, 1903, the name of a genus of Nematodes, which had been included in the first instalment of names placed on the " Official List " in 1915 (*Opinion* 66).

This name was invalid because, under the decision given in *Opinion* 125 (relating to *Borus* Agassiz, 1846—an emendation of *Boros* Herbst, 1797—and *Borus* Albers, 1850), *Necator* Stiles, 1903, must be regarded as a junior homonym of *Necator* Sclater and Saunders, 1896, an emendation of *Nicator* Finsch and Hartlaub, 1870, a genus in the Class Aves. Immediately upon making the foregoing discovery, he, as Secretary to the Commission, had consulted the late Dr. W. L. Sclater, who had informed him that no inconvenience would be experienced by ornithologists if the Commission were to suppress the name *Necator* Sclater and Saunders, 1896 (in the Class Aves), for the purpose of validating the generic name *Necator* Stiles, 1903, in the Class Nematoda, for the genus of birds concerned was always known by the name *Nicator*, the spelling originally used by Finsch and Hartlaub.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

  (a) to suppress for all purposes the generic name *Necator* Sclater and Saunders, 1896 (Class Aves), an emendation of the name *Nicator* Finsch and Hartlaub, 1870 ;

  (b) to validate the generic name *Necator* Stiles, 1903 (Class Nematoda) ;

(2) to confirm the entry of the name *Necator* Stiles, 1903, made in the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " in accordance with the directions given in *Opinion* 66 ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* setting out the foregoing decisions.

Validation, under the plenary powers, of long-established use of the generic names " Tethys " and " Aplysia " (Class Gastropoda) and matters incidental thereto

27. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)22) submitted by Dr. H. Engel (Netherlands) that the Commission should use their plenary powers to validate the long-established usage of the generic names *Tethys* and *Aplysia* (Class Gastropoda), to designate the type species of those genera in a manner which would eliminate all further possibility of confusion in regard to the foregoing names, and to take certain other action incidental thereto.

In the discussion on this proposal, the view was generally expressed that a decision on this case was long overdue, both because of the importance of the names concerned and because of the excessive delays which had occurred in the handling of this case by the Commission.

COMMISSIONER H. BOSCHMA (NETHERLANDS) said that he shared the general view that a decision ought now to be taken by the Commission for stabilising the usage of the names *Tethys* and *Aplysia* ; he pointed out however that the application submitted asked also for decisions in regard to certain specific trivial names which were not directly concerned with the main problem at issue. He suggested that the Commission should deal as proposed with the names *Tethys* and *Aplysia* but that they should defer taking decisions regarding the portion of the application which related to specific trivial names not directly involved in the stabilisation of the foregoing generic names.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that it would be impossible to deal with the generic names *Tethys* and *Aplysia* without at the same time dealing with the associated question of the trivial names of the species to be designated as the type species of those genera. The question of the trivial names of the other species dealt with in the present application could however be dealt with separately at a later stage, although the adoption of this course would offend against the canon suggested by Commissioner Boschma in another case that the Commission should in future carefully abstain from their former practice of giving answers to a part only of any given application submitted to them for decision.

(Later reference: Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusion 2)

IN FURTHER DISCUSSION it was generally agreed that the questions submitted in the present application in regard to certain specific trivial names, other than those of the species to be specified as the type species of the genera *Tethys* and *Aplysia*, might properly be deferred for later consideration, provided, first, that these matters were brought to a decision as soon as possible after the close of the present Session, and, second, that the postponement of a decision on this part of the application submitted should not be held available to be cited as a precedent for similar action on any future occasion.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that under Article 19 of the *Règles* the spelling of the generic name *Laplysia* Linnaeus, 1767 (*Syst. Nat.*) (ed. 12), **1**(2) : 1089) was to be emended to *Aplysia;*

(2) to use their plenary powers :—

  (a) to suppress for all purposes the generic name *Tethys* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10), **1** : 653) and any other use of that name, prior to the publication of the generic name *Tethys* Linnaeus, 1767 ;

(b) to suppress, for all purposes, other than those of Article 35, the use in the genus *Tethys* Linnaeus, 1767, of the specific trivial names *leporina* and *limacina;*

(c) to suppress all uses of the specific trivial name *depilans* in the genus *Aplysia* (emend. of *Laplysia*) Linnaeus, 1767, prior to its publication, in the combination *Aplysia depilans*, by Gmelin in 1791 (*in* Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13), **1** : 3103);

(d) to validate the generic name *Tethys* Linnaeus, 1767;

(e) to validate the undermentioned trivial names and to direct that those names were to be used in preference to any other trivial names for the species respectively concerned :—

  (i) the trivial name *depilans* as published in the binominal combination *Aplysia depilans* by Gmelin in 1791;

  (ii) the trivial name *fimbria* as published in the binominal combination *Tethys fimbria* by Linnaeus in 1767;

(f) to set aside all type selections for the genera *Aplysia* Linnaeus, 1767, and *Tethys* Linnaeus, 1767, made prior to the present decision, and to direct that the type species of these genera shall be the species specified below :—

Name of genus	*Type species*
Aplysia Linnaeus, 1767	*Aplysia depilans* Gmelin, 1791
Tethys Linnaeus, 1767	*Tethys fimbria* Linnaeus, 1767

(3) to place on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " the generic names *Aplysia* Linnaeus, 1767, and *Tethys* Linnaeus, 1767 (Class Gastropoda, Order Opisthobranchiata), with the type species severally specified above, and on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " the specific trivial names *depilans* Gmelin, 1791 (as published in the binominal combination *Aplysia depilans*) and *fimbria* Linnaeus, 1767 (as published in the binominal combination *Tethys fimbria*;

(4) without prejudice to the general principle that decisions should be given by the Commission on

all questions raised in any given application and on the strict understanding that the action now to be taken should not be held available to be cited on any future occasion as a precedent in favour of dilatory procedure, to postpone for further consideration the question of fixing, under the plenary powers, the identity of the species to which the undermentioned specific trivial names should apply :—

fasciata Poiret, 1789 (as published in the binominal combination *Aplysia fasciata* Poiret, 1789, *Voy. Barbare*, **2** : 2) ;

punctata Cuvier, 1803 (as published in the binominal combination *Laplysia* [sic] *punctata* Cuvier, 1803, *Ann. Mus. Hist. nat.*, Paris, **2** : 310).

(5) to request the Secretary to the Commission to resubmit the portion of Dr. Engel's application relating to the names specified in (4) as soon as possible after the close of the present Session, with a view to a decision being taken by the Commission thereon without further delay ;

(6) to render an *Opinion* setting out the decisions specified in (1) to (5) above.

" Venus " Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Pelecypoda): designation of type species, under the plenary powers

28. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)189) submitted by Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (U.S.A.), that the Commission should use their plenary powers to set aside the designation of *Venus dione* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Venus* Linnaeus, 1758, and to validate the long-established usage of that generic name, by designating, as the type species, either *Venus verrucosa* Linnaeus, 1758, or *Venus mercenaria* Linnaeus, 1758.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to set aside all selections of the type species of the genus *Venus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Eulamellibranchia), made prior to the present decision and to designate *Venus verrucosa* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of this genus ;

(2) to place the generic name *Venus* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species : *Venus verrucosa* Linnaeus, 1758), on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the specific trivial name *verrucosa* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Venus verrucosa*), on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* setting out the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

" Bulla " Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Gastropoda) : designation of type species of, under the plenary powers

29. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)190) submitted by Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (U.S.A.), in consultation with Dr. Harald E. Rehder (U.S.A.), that the Commission should use their plenary powers to set aside the designation of *Bulla naucum* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Bulla* Linnaeus, 1758, and to preserve the long-established usage of the name by designating *Bulla ampulla* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to set aside all selections of the type species of the genus *Bulla* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Gastropoda, Order Bullomorpha), made prior to the present decision and to designate *Bulla ampulla* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of this genus ;

(2) to place the generic name *Bulla* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species : *Bulla ampulla* Linnaeus, 1758), on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the specific trivial name *ampulla* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Bulla ampulla*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* setting out the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

(*At this point the decisions reached by the Commission in regard to the names* Tethys *and* Aplysia, Venus *and* Bulla *were reported to the Section on Nomenclature.*)

Twelfth meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session : time appointed

(*Previous reference: Paris Session,* 11*th Meeting, Conclusion* 2)

30. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) then proposed that the Commission and the Section on Nomenclature should now adjourn. The next meeting which, like the present meeting, would consist of concurrent meetings of the Commission and of the Section, would be held at 1445 hours that afternoon.

THE COMMISSION took note of the above arrangements.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned at* 1225 *hours*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 21st-27th July, 1948.

CONCLUSIONS of the Twelfth Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July 1948 at 1445 hours

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Fourth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature*)

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Professor K. Mansour (Egypt)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present :

M. Belloc (France)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (U.S.A.)
Dr. Isabel Gordon (United Kingdom)
Professor E. R. Hall (U.S.A.)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Dr. H. H. J. Nesbitt (Canada)
M. G. Ranson (France)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ethelwynn Trewavas (United Kingdom)
Mr. R. Winckworth (United Kingdom)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*

"Gryphaea" Lamarck, 1801 (Class Pelecypoda), problem of type species of : communication by M. Gilbert Ranson

1. THE COMMISSION, jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, had under consideration a communication[12] submitted by M. Gilbert Ranson (France) on the question of the type species of the genus *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Pseudolamellibranchiata) (file Z.N.(S.) 365).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to defer for consideration after the close of the present (Paris) Congress the application submitted by M. G.

---

[12] For the text of the communication made by M. Ranson, see pages 168-170 of Volume 3 of this journal, and for the record of the discussion in the Section on Nomenclature, see pages 96-8 of Volume 5.

Ranson in regard to the type species of the genus *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Pseudolamellibranchiata).

Status of generic names published in books dealing with classification of taxonomic units down to the genus level but no further : case of Brünnich, 1771, " Zoologiae Fundamenta"

2. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a request submitted by Mr. R. Winckworth (United Kingdom) that a ruling should be given on the question whether new generic names published by Brünnich in 1772 in his *Zoologiae Fundamenta* were to be regarded as complying with the provisions of Article 25, Proviso (b) (file Z.N.(S.)151). The text of Mr. Winckworth's application had been published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in 1945 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 113–117, *facsimile*).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, while it was important that a decision should be taken on the status of the nine generic names published for the first time in Brünnich's *Zoologiae Fundamenta*, which formed the subject matter of Mr. Winckworth's application, it was much more important that the Commission should reach a decision on the question of principle involved in the acceptance or rejection of those names, namely whether an author was to be regarded as having applied the principles of binominal nomenclature (" appliqué les principes de la nomenclature binominale "), as required by Proviso (b) to Article 25, as amended by the present Congress, where, in the work in question, that author was concerned with general questions of classification and did not carry his analysis below the genus level. A new generic name published in such a book after 31st December, 1930, was clearly ruled out by the terms of Proviso (c), the proviso added to Article 25, with effect from that date, under a decision taken by the Tenth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Budapest in 1927. The status of a new generic name published in such a work prior to 1st January, 1931, had never been clearly defined, and the present was a good opportunity for reaching a decision on this subject with a view to the submission to the Section on Nomenclature of a recommendation for the clarification of the *Règles* in this regard. On a point of detail, it should be noted that, subsequent to the publication of Mr. Winckworth's paper, the attention of the Commission had been drawn by Dr. Kurt Teichert (University of Western Australia) to the fact that the University of Copenhagen possessed a copy of Brünnich's *Zoologiae Fundamenta*, dated " 1771," as well as copies dated " 1772," the date cited by Mr. Winckworth. The two editions were identical except for the date on the title page. In view of this information, this book should in future be attributed to the year 1771. The Acting President added that the Commission were very glad to have Mr. Winckworth with them that afternoon and he called upon him to present his application in person.

MR. R. WINCKWORTH (UNITED KINGDOM) said that in the *Zoologiae Fundamenta* Brünnich gave a general description in Latin (left-hand pages) and Danish (right-hand pages) of the classification of the Animal Kingdom, including tables of all the genera. He did not, however, cite the names of species, as regards which he stated in the preface: "Enumeratio specierum nimis foret prolixa." It was evident that it was only on the grounds of space that Brünnich stopped short at the genus level. He (Mr. Winckworth) asked the Commission to declare that the generic names used by Brünnich in the *Zoologiae Fundamenta* were available under Article 25 of the *Règles*. He asked also that one of the new names published by Brünnich, namely *Tonna* Brünnich, should be placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" with *Buccinum galea* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species. The other new generic names published in the *Zoologiae Fundamenta* would need to be dealt with on their merits in the light of advice received from specialists, but it might be thought appropriate to suppress the name *Orthoceros* Brünnich, for, if *Nautilus orthocera* Linnaeus, 1758, were to be taken as the type species, it would run counter to the plan of Brünnich's book which was not concerned with fossils.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) suggested that it might be convenient to take a decision first on the general issue involved, and second,to take such decisions as might be considered appropriate in regard to individual names concerned. As to the nature of that decision, he was in full agreement with Mr. Winckworth that Brünnich's *Zoologiae Fundamenta* satisfied the requirements of Article 25 and that it was desirable that the Commission should render an *Opinion* to that effect. He was however of the opinion also that, in order to prevent the recurrence in the case of other books of doubts similar to those which had arisen in the present case, it was desirable that the Commission should recommend to the Section on Nomenclature that words should be inserted in the *Règles* clarifying the application of Proviso (b) to Article 25 in relation to books such as Brünnich's *Zoologiae Fundamenta*. The Acting President further observed that, as the Commission were painfully aware from their experience with Meigen's *Nouvelle Classification* of 1800, it was often very dangerous for the Commission to give a ruling that a given book was an available book without at the same time examining the effect of that decision on the nomenclature of the group concerned, for such a decision, although perfectly correct, was capable of causing great confusion in nomenclature, unless appropriate preventive action were taken immediately by the Commission under its plenary powers. He accordingly suggested that the Commission should recommend to the Section on Nomenclature that there should be inserted in the *Règles* a provision prescribing that, where the Commission gave a ruling that a given book satisfied the requirements of Article 25, it should be the duty of the Commission, in consultation with specialists, to examine the names first published in that book and, having done so, to place on the appropriate " Official List " such of the names concerned as were nomenclatorially available and also the oldest available names for the taxonomic units concerned, except, where the adoption of any given name concerned would lead to instability and confusion in the nomenclature of the group concerned, in which case it should be made the duty of the Commission to suppress the name concerned under their plenary powers. It should be the duty of the Commission also to place on the appropriate " Official Index " any new name published in such a book that was either not available nomenclatorially or was not the oldest available name for the taxonomic unit concerned, together with any name which might have been suppressed under the plenary powers under the procedure suggested above.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, an author had published a new generic name in a work dealing with classification down to the generic level but no further, it was not necessary for the purpose of Proviso (b) to Article 25 that in the work concerned the author in question should have cited trivial names of species under that genus or other genera discussed in the book concerned, provided that it was evident that the author concerned would have applied the principles of binominal nomenclature for species if in the book concerned he had dealt with taxonomic units below the genus level ;

(2) to recommend that words should be inserted in Article 25, embodying, in relation to Proviso (b) to that Article, the interpretation given in (1) above ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* stating that, for the reasons given in (1) above, the generic names published in

Brünnich, 1771, *Zoologiae Fundamenta* complied with the requirements of Article 25 of the *Règles*;

(4) to recommend that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing that, where the Commission gave a ruling that a given book of previously doubtful status satisfied the requirements of Article 25, it should be the duty of the Commission, in consultation with specialists, to examine the names first published in that book and, having done so, (a) to place on the appropriate " Official List " such of the names concerned as are (i) nomenclatorially available and (ii) the oldest available names for the taxonomic units concerned, save, in the latter event, where, in the opinion of the Commission, the adoption of the name concerned would cause instability and confusion in the nomenclature of the group concerned, in which case the name in question should be suppressed under the plenary powers, and (b) to place on the appropriate " Official Index " any name found to be either not available nomenclatorially or not the oldest name for the taxonomic unit in question, together with any name or names suppressed under the plenary powers in accordance with (a) above.

" Tonna " Brünnich, 1771 (Class Gastropoda), placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology "

3. Arising out of the discussion on the proposal (file Z.N.(S.)151) in regard to the status of generic names first published in Brünnich, 1771, *Zoologiae Fundamenta*, recorded in Conclusion 2 above, THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to place the generic name *Tonna* Brünnich, 1771, *Zool. Fundamenta* : 248, 232 (type species : *Buccinum galea* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10), **1** : 734, designated by Suter, 1913, *Manual N.Z. Moll.* : 314) on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(2) to place the specific trivial name *galea* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Buccinum galea*), on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions set out in (1) and (2) above.

The word " Cercopithecus, " validated as a generic name as from Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Mammalia, Order Primates),

4. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that one of the names which, as matters now stood, was a name first published by Brünnich in the *Zoologiae Fundamenta*, was the name *Cercopithecus* Brünnich, 1771 (Class Mammalia, Order Primates). This

and type species designated, under the plenary powers

word had originally been published in the nominative plural (as "Cercopitheci") by Linnaeus in 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10), **1** : 26), as the name of a subdivision of the genus *Simia* Linnaeus, 1758. It possessed no status, however, as a subgeneric name as from that date, for in *Opinion* 124 the Commission had ruled that these infra-generic group names, as used by Linnaeus in 1758, were not to be accepted as of subgeneric rank as from the date of being so published. Unfortunately, however, in an earlier *Opinion*, *Opinion* 104 (published in 1928), the Commission had inadvertently accepted a proposal that *Cercopithecus*, attributed to Linnaeus, 1758, should be placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" (with *Simia diana* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species). This error must be rectified either by deleting the foregoing entry from the "Official List" or by validating it under the Commission's plenary powers. The latter course was the one which he (the Acting President) recommended. If this course were to be adopted no problem would arise in connection with the name *Cercopithecus* Brünnich, 1771.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to validate the name *Cercopithecus* as from Linnaeus, 1758, and to designate *Simia diana* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of this genus ;

(2) to confirm, in the light of (1) above, the (previously erroneous) entry of the name *Cercopithecus* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species as specified in (1) above), made in the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" in accordance with the directions given in *Opinion* 104 ;

(3) to place the specific trivial name *diana* Linnaeus, 1758 (as originally published in the combination *Simia diana* Linnaeus, 1758), on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" ; and the name *Cercopithecus* Brünnick, 1771, on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* setting out the decisions recorded in (1) to (3) above.

"Limulus" Müller, 1785 (Class Arachnida, Order Xiphosura) placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" by "Opinion" 104, a synonym of "Xiphosura"

5. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) next drew attention to the fact that, as pointed out by Mr. Winckworth (1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 116), one effect of accepting the new generic names published by Brünnich in his *Zoologiae Fundamenta* of 1771 was to validate as from that date the generic name *Xiphosura* Brünnich, with *Monoculus polyphemus* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species. This result was objectionable from two points

Brünnich, 1771: situation so disclosed to be given immediate consideration

of view: (1) *Monoculus polyphemus* Linnaeus, 1758, was the type species of the well-known genus *Limulus* Müller, 1785, the name of which had been placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" by *Opinion* 104. In the circumstances now disclosed, that entry was seen to have been erroneous and must now either be validated (under the Commission's plenary powers) or cancelled. (2) The genus *Limulus* Müller belonged to the Order Xiphosura of the Class Arachnida, and it would be objectionable to have in an Order a genus bearing the same name (*Xiphosura* Brünnich) as that of the Order itself. It appeared to him (the Acting President) that this was a case where the strict application of the *Règles* would lead to greater confusion than uniformity, but he thought that it would be desirable that the Commission should take the views of interested specialists before reaching a decision. The matter was urgent, however, for it should certainly be settled before the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" (now in the press) was published in book form.

THE COMMISSION agreed:—

> that consideration should be given as soon as possible after the close of the present (Paris) Congress to the question whether the name *Limulus* Müller, 1785, erroneously placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" by *Opinion* 104 should be validated under the plenary powers or alternatively be removed from the "Official List", and that to this end the Secretary to the Commission be asked to prepare a Report on this subject, with recommendations, for the consideration of the Commission.

"Orthoceros" Brünnich, 1771: decision on postponed, pending further consultations with palaeontologists

6. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING), referring to the generic name *Orthoceros*, which now became an available name as from Brünnich, 1771, said that, prior to the opening of the present (Paris) Congress, he had had correspondence with Mr. Winckworth on the question whether it was desirable that this name should be suppressed by the Commission under their plenary powers. He had had also correspondence on this subject with Dr. A. K. Miller (U.S.A.), Dr. Kurt Teichert (University of Western Australia) and others (file Z.N.(S.)44). In view of the interest of palaeontologists in this name, he suggested that the Commission should at this point confine themselves to taking note of Mr. Winckworth's suggestion that the name *Orthoceros* Brünnich, 1771, should be suppressed for nomenclatorial purposes and should defer taking a final decision on this question until the views of palaeontologists had been more fully ascertained.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

> to invite the Secretary to complete as quickly as possible his consultations with palaeontologists on the action to be taken in regard to the generic name *Orthoceros* Brünnich, 1771, and in the light of those consultations and of the present discussion, to submit a proposal to the Commission for consideration.

" Manatus " Brünnich, 1771, " Rosmarus " Brünnich, 1771, and " Ammonia " Brünnich, 1771 : Report on, asked for

7. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that there were three generic names (*Manatus, Rosmarus, Ammonia*) which, in consequence of the decision which had just been taken (in Conclusion 2 above) that new generic names published in Brünnich's *Zoologiae Fundamenta* satisfied the requirements of Article 25 of the *Règles* were now seen first to have been validly published in the foregoing work. In accordance with the procedure which the Commission had agreed (in the same Conclusion) to adopt in such cases, these three generic names should either be placed on the appropriate " Official List " or " Official Index " or, as the case might be, suppressed by the Commission under their plenary powers.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

> to invite the Secretary to confer with specialists in the groups concerned with the purpose of submitting a Report, with recommendations, on the action to be taken in regard to the following generic names first validly published by Brünnich in 1771 in his *Zoologiae Fundamenta:* (1) *Manatus* Brünnich ; (2) *Rosmarus* Brünnich*:* (3) *Ammonia* Brünnich.

Brisson, 1762, " Regnum Animale " (status of generic names published in) : consideration of, postponed

8. In the course of the discussion of the generic names first published by Brünnich in 1771 in his *Zoologiae Fundamenta* recorded in the preceding Conclusion, THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) observed that the status of five of the generic names published in that work (*Lutra, Hyaena, Giraffa, Tapirus, Ceratodon*) could not be finally determined until a decision had been taken by the Commission on the status of the generic names published by Brisson in 1762 in the Second Edition of his *Regnum Animale*, for each of the five names concerned had been published by Brisson in the foregoing work and should be attributed to that author if the *Regnum Animale* were to be found to comply with the requirements of Article 25 of the *Règles*. If however it were necessary to reject that work, then Brünnich's *Zoologiae Fundamenta* was the

first work in which those names had been validly published with an indication by a binominal author. Continuing, the Acting President said that, as the Commission would recall, the question of the availability of names in Brisson's *Regnum Animale* had been submitted to them for decision in a brief note prepared by Dr. G. H. H. Tate (American Museum of Natural History, New York) (file Z.N.(S.)124), which had been published in 1945 (Tate, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 115). Having regard to the importance of this question to mammalogists and in view also of the rarity of Brisson's *Regnum Animale*, he (the Acting President), in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, had come to the conclusion that a full presentation of the issues involved was desirable before a decision was taken by the Commission. He had accordingly prepared for the consideration of the Commission a paper on this subject, illustrated by *facsimile* reproductions of extracts from Brisson's book. This paper would be published as soon as possible in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature.* In the circumstances, he (the Acting President) suggested that the Commission should defer taking a decision on the status of the names in Brisson's *Regnum Animale* of 1762 until they had had an opportunity of studying the paper referred to above but that, in taking this decision, they should take note of the fact that, if the foregoing work were to be rejected as not satisfying the requirements of Article 25, the place in which the five generic names to which he had referred would be found to have been first validly published in conditions which satisfied the requirements of Article 25 would be Brünnich's *Zoologiae Fundamenta* of 1771

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to take into consideration the question of the status of generic names first published in Brisson, 1762, *Regnum Animale*, as soon as possible after the publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* of the paper on this subject prepared by the Secretary ;

(2) to take note that, if it were found that the above work did not satisfy the requirements of Article 25, the names of the undermentioned genera in the Class Mammalia *Lutra*, *Hyaena*, *Giraffa*, *Tapirus*, *Ceratodon* would be found to have been first published by Brünnich in 1771 in his *Zoologiae Fundamenta*.

" Hyaena " Brisson, 1762, " Lutra " Brisson, 1762, and

9. Arising out of the discussion on the item recorded in Conclusion 8 above, THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to defer, until a decision had been reached on the

" Meles " Brisson, 1762 : postponement of proposal for addition to the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology ", pending decision on status of Brisson's " Regnum Animale" under Proviso (b) to Article 25

question of the availability of generic names published in Brisson in 1762, *Regnum Animale*, consideration of the proposal submitted by the late Dr. C. W. Stiles (file Z.N.(S.)177) (on which a note had been published by Secretary Hemming, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 112–113) that there should be added to the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " the names of three genera (*Hyaena, Lutra, Meles*) of the Order Carnivora (Class Mammalia) published by Brisson in the *Regnum Animale*, from species of which had been reported parasites common to Man.

Clerck, 1757, " Aranei Svecici " : proposed validation for nomenclatorial purposes of the names published in : discussion on, concluded

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 10th Meeting, Conclusion* 5)

10. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) proposed that at this point the Commission should resume their consideration of the proposal that the names published in 1757 in Clerck's *Aranei svecici* should be accepted for nomenclatorial purposes, notwithstanding that, having been published before 1758, those names had been published before the starting point of zoological nomenclature, which had been submitted to the Commission at their Tenth Meeting (held concurrently with the Second Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature) by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) on behalf of a large group of Arachnologists. The Commission would recall that, on the adjournment of their earlier discussion of this problem, he (the Acting President) had handed the dossier relating to this case (file Z.N.(S.)238) to Professor L. di Caporiacco as the Arachnologist member of the Commission and had intimated that he would call upon him to open the discussion when the Commission reverted to the consideration of this problem.

PROFESSOR L. DI CAPORIACCO (ITALY) said that, in accordance with the request made to him by the Acting President at the tenth meeting of the Commission held on 24th July, he had carefully studied the whole dossier relating to the application for the validation of the names for certain species of spiders published in 1757 in Clerck's *Aranei svecici*. For the reasons which he proposed to place before the Commission he was satisfied that it was desirable that they should take appropriate steps, either under the plenary powers or otherwise, to validate these names.

It should be noted, first, that in his *Aranei svecici* Clerck used a strictly binominal terminology in describing the species dealt with in that work. The descriptions given by Clerck were fully recognisable : there was no doubt at all regarding the identity of the 68 nominal species concerned, of which 55 were to-day universally accepted as good species, while the remaining 13 nominal species were perfectly recognisable synonyms of other species described by Clerck in the same work. When one turned to Linnaeus, one found that most of the species which he described would be unrecognisable, if in a number of cases he had not himself cited the names previously published by Clerck or if in other cases there had not been other sources from which it could be shown that the nominal species in question were synonyms of species described by Clerck.

Almost all Arachnologists since the time of Linnaeus had adopted the names published by Clerck and had attributed those names to Clerck, instead of adopting the names published by Linnaeus or, when the names were the same, attributing them to Linnaeus. Professor Bonnet had given some very interesting statistics regarding the number of times on which the names published by Clerck had been used by Arachnologists in preference to those of Linnaeus, prior to the year 1892 when it was laid down in the *Règles* adopted by the Second International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held in Moscow that the year 1758 was to be accepted as the starting point of zoological nomenclature. These statistics showed that during this long period the names published by Clerck were used three times as frequently as those published by Linnaeus.

In spite of the decision taken in 1892 there was no change after that year in the practice of Arachnologists in this matter. An overwhelming majority continued to use Clerck's names in preference to those of Linnaeus. In the 56 years concerned Clerck's names had on the average been used four times as frequently as those of Linnaeus. The balance of usage in favour of Clerck's names thus actually increased after 1892. It could be said that in modern times only the German and Hungarian Arachnologists had used the names published by Linnaeus in preference to those of Clerck, but even those Arachnologists had realised that Clerck's names were so much better known than those of Linnaeus that, in order to make themselves understood by other specialists, they had adopted the practice of citing Clerck's names in brackets whenever they used the Linnaean names.

Looking forward into the future, there was no prospect that the situation was likely to change with the passage of time. It should be noted that in all works dealing with the arachnological fauna of particular countries the names used were those of Clerck and not those of Linnaeus. Thus, when a young student first studied the Class Arachnida, he always became acquainted with the commonest European species under the Clerckian names; when he had become thoroughly accustomed to using those names, it was unlikely that he would later be willing to abandon them in favour of those published by Linnaeus. Professor Bonnet had made an inquiry on this subject among all working Arachnologists. Of the 62 specialists consulted, 47 used the Clerckian names, while 13 used those of Linnaeus; the remaining two, not being workers on the European fauna, had no occasion to use either the Clerckian or the Linnaean names. Professor Bonnet had been prevented by circumstances from obtaining replies from two of the specialists who used the Linnaean names, but, as regards the remaining 11, it was noteworthy that seven—that was, a substantial majority—had declared themselves as being in favour of the Clerckian names. Thus, out of the total of 62 specialists in Arachnida, four only had declared themselves as opposed to the adoption of Clerck's names. Of these, one was an Australian who had never dealt with the spiders of Europe, with which alone the names of Clerck were concerned, while another (Mr. Hull) used the trivial names of Clerck, while refusing to accept the generic name *Araneus* Clerck (or indeed the generic name *Aranea* Linnaeus).

As there was almost complete unanimity in favour of the validation of Clerck's names, it would be useful to examine the nature of the reasons advanced against that course. These were found to be two in number.

First, it was argued that Clerck's name "*Araneus*" was not a generic name, because he divided his "Genus Araneus" into a number of families. If this was a valid argument, then not only the generic name *Araneus* Clerck but also the genera established by Latreille, Walckenaer and some of the other early entomologists would have to be rejected, for they were all accustomed to divide their genera into what they termed families. The fact was that in the XVIIIth century and the early part of the XIXth century the expression "family" had an entirely different meaning from that which it had since acquired. Zoologists did not reject—and no zoologists had urged the rejection of—the generic names published by Latreille, Walckenaer and others on the ground that they divided their genera into families. There was therefore no reason why on this account the names published by Clerck should be rejected.

The second argument which had been advanced against the acceptance of Clerck's names was prompted by the fear of creating a precedent: once the inviolability of the year 1758 had been abandoned for one group, there was risk, it was argued, that specialists in other groups might ask for similar exceptions. Against this argument must be set the fact that there was almost complete unanimity among

Arachnologists in favour of an exception being made for Clerck's names, while the fact that the number of workers in other groups was much greater than the number of workers on the Arachnida made it virtually impossible to secure among, for example, malacologists or ornithologists (who would be the groups most likely to raise such proposals) the same degree of unanimity as was found among the 62 Arachnologists.

There was therefore no good ground for rejecting the request for the validation of the Arachnid names published by Clerck in 1757. On the other hand, the refusal of that request would mean that in the future, as in the past, the commonest European spiders would be designated either by names which were not in accordance with the *Règles Internationales* or be known by a double name (the Linnaean and the Clerckian). In either case, the result would be greater confusion than uniformity.

A LONG DISCUSSION then ensued in which general agreement was expressed in regard to the need for meeting the wishes of the applicants, and in which, in consequence, attention was concentrated upon the means to be adopted to secure this end. On the one hand, it was evident that any decision, to produce the results desired, must be such that it gave precedence to the Clerckian names over those published by Linnaeus in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae*, which, under the terms of Article 26 of the *Règles*, when read with the interpretation given in *Opinion* 3, was deemed to have been published on 1st January, 1758, and therefore prior to any other zoological work published in that year. On the other hand, it would be embarrassing to validate the Clerckian names as from the date of their publication in 1757, for this would run counter to another provision in Article 26, namely that 1st January, 1758, was to be taken as the starting point of zoological nomenclature. In the course of the discussion, a suggestion was put forward that the Commission should overcome these difficulties by using their plenary powers to prescribe that Clerck's *Aranei svecici* was to be deemed to have been published in 1758 on some date prior to the publication of the *Systema Naturae* of Linnaeus, but this suggestion was rejected on the grounds that it would be objectionable deliberately to falsify the date of publication of a book, of which the true date of publication was well known. It was then suggested that, while it should be recognised that Clerck's *Aranei svecici* was published in 1757, it should be laid down by the Commission that for nomenclatorial purposes names published in that work were to be accorded priority (under Article 25) as from 1758 and were to be granted precedence over names for the same taxonomic units (the genus *Araneus* and the species placed by Clerck in that genus) published by Linnaeus in 1758 in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae.* The view was expressed, however, that, having regard to the exceptional character of the present case, it would be preferable that the proposed decision should be expressly recorded in Article 26 as an exception to the general rule there laid down rather than that the Commission should act in this matter under their plenary powers (as they clearly could, if they were so to decide) and that the decisions so taken should then be recorded in the Schedule to the *Règles* set apart for the recording of decisions taken under those powers. It was important to mark in every possible way the exceptional character of the decision taken in the present case.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that a proviso should be added to Article 26 directing that, notwithstanding the general provisions of that Article, the generic name *Araneus* and the specific trivial names for species of the Class Arachnida published in 1757 in Clerck's *Aranei svecici* are to be treated as though they had been published subsequent to the starting point of zoological nomenclature and are to have priority as though they had been published in the year 1758 on some date prior to the publication of the 10th edition of Linnaeus's *Systema Naturae.*

" Bilharzia " Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856, suppressed, and " Schistosoma " Weinland, 1858 (Class Trematoda), validated, under the plenary powers

11. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the following papers relating to the case of the generic names *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856, and *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858 (Class Trematoda, Order Digenea) (file Z.N.(S.)138) :—

(a) an application received from Dr. H. Vogel, Institut für Schiffs- und Tropenkrankheiten, Hamburg, for a declaration that the generic name *Bilharzia* attributed to Meckel von Hemsbach, the first author by whom it was published, and with priority as from 1856 (the date on which it was published by that author) had precedence over, and should be used in place of the later name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858, published for the same species (Vogel, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 193–194) ;

(b) a note by the Secretary to the Commission drawing attention to the fact that the name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858, had been placed by the Commission on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " by a decision taken in their *Opinion* 77, and that, in consequence, the recognition of the prior rights of the name *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856 (the existence of which was not known to the Commission when they rendered their *Opinion* 77) would involve the removal of the name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858, from the "Official List," and inviting interested specialists to inform the Commission whether they considered that in the circumstances the removal of the name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858, was desirable or whether it would be preferable, in the interest of avoiding confusion that the Commission should use their powers to suppress the name *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856, and to validate the name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858 (Hemming, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 195–196).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that in response to the invitation contained in the paper published by himself in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in 1947 and of the notices on the subject to which it had given rise in the journal *Science*, 15 specialists had written to him on this subject, of whom one only was in favour of the strict application in this case of the Law of Priority and in consequence of the use of the name *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, while 14 were in favour of the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to validate the name *Schistosoma* Weinland. Since his arrival in Paris, Professor K. Mansour (Egypt) had spoken to him in regard to this case and had indicated that he was in favour of reviving the use of the name *Bilharzia*. Of the specialists who had communicated their views on this subject, the two who favoured the name *Bilharzia* were British and Egyptian respectively, while of the 14 who favoured the suppression of that name in favour of the name *Schistosoma*, 12 wrote from the United States, one from Canada, and one from Great Britain. The Acting President added that it appeared clear to him that there was an overwhelming consensus of opinion in favour of the validation of the name *Schistosoma* Weinland. The Commission had placed that name on the "Official List" in good faith, believing it to be the oldest name for this important genus, it being then thought by all concerned that the name *Bilharzia* had not been published until 1859 (by Cobbold), i.e. not until a year after the publication of the name *Schistosoma*. They certainly would not have taken that action at that time, when the name *Bilharzia* (attributed to Cobbold) was in wide use if they had known what the true position was. In the 26 years that had elapsed since the name *Schistosoma* was placed, though erroneously, upon the "Official List," that name had very largely replaced the name *Bilharzia;* new issues were therefore raised by the discovery that *Bilharzia* was the older name, for it was necessary to consider also the effect on medical literature of a reversal of the practice which for over a quarter of a century had been believed to possess the highest nomenclatorial authority. In view of the general sense of the advice received from interested specialists, he (the Acting President) recommended that the Commission should use their plenary powers to suppress the name *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856, and to validate the name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858.

The following are the names of the specialists who made representations to the Commission either in favour of the name *Bilharzia* or of the name *Schistosoma:*—

(1) *Specialists in favour of the name* Bilharzia :—

Professor E. T. Leiper, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Institute of Agricultural Parasitology, St. Albans, England.

Professor K. Mansour, Fouad University, Cairo, Egypt.

(2) *Specialists in favour of the name* Schistosoma :—

Dr. H. A. Baylis, British Museum (Natural History), Department of Zoology, London, England.

Professor Harold Kirby, University of California, Department of Zoology, Berkeley, Cal., U.S.A.

Dr. W. H. Wright, Chief, Division of Tropical Diseases, National Institute of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, U.S.A.

Dr. Eloise B. Cram, Medical Parasitologist, Division of Tropical Diseases, National Institute of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, U.S.A.

Dr. Louis J. Olivier, Senior Assistant Scientist, Division of Tropical Diseases, National Institute of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, U.S.A.

Dr. Myrna F. Jones, Zoologist, Division of Tropical Diseases, National Institute of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, U.S.A.

Dr. Mabelle O. Nolan, Zoologist, Division of Tropical Diseases, National Institute of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, U.S.A.

Dr. T. W. M. Cameron, Director, Institute of Parasitology, Macdonald College of McGill University, Que., Canada.

Dr. M. S. Ferguson, U.S. Public Health Service, Communicable Disease Center, Atlanta, Georgia, U.S.A.

Dr. Hugh Pankhurst, Gloucester, Mass., U.S.A.

Professor Ernest Carroll Faust, The Tulane University of Louisiana, School of Medicine, Department of Tropical Medicine, and Public Health, New Orleans, U.S.A.

Dr. David S. Ruhe, U.S. Public Health Service, Communicable Diseases Center, Atlanta, Georgia, U.S.A.

Professor Deane P. Furman, University of California, College of Agriculture, Division of Entomology and Parasitology, Berkeley, Cal., U.S.A.

Professor Charles H. Blake, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Biology, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

In the discussion which followed PROFESSOR R. L. USINGER (U.S.A.) supported the proposal that the plenary powers of the Commission should be used to validate the name *Schistosoma* which had become deeply embedded in the literature relating to the Trematoda and in medical literature generally. Nothing but confusion would result if it were necessary to revert to the name *Bilharzia*.

PROFESSOR K. MANSOUR (EGYPT) said that this problem was one of special interest to Egyptian zoologists and Egyptian medical men, for it was in Egypt that the disease bilharziasis was of special importance; the name *Bilharzia* was still universally used in Egypt for the Trematode parasite concerned. Now that it was clear that the name *Bilharzia* had priority over the name *Schistosoma*, it should be brought back into universal use.

DR. ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY (U.S.A.) (a member of the Section on Nomenclature present at the meeting) strongly supported the proposal that the name *Schistosoma* should be validated. Any other course would lead to confusion in medical literature.

COMMISSIONER H. BOSCHMA (NETHERLANDS) expressed support for the proposal that in the circumstances the name *Schistosoma* should be validated, in spite of the fact that at one time the name *Bilharzia* had been much more frequently used.

PROFESSOR K. MANSOUR (EGYPT) said that he recognised that American workers used the name *Schistosoma* in preference to the name *Bilharzia*, but the medical problem involved, and therefore the nomenclatorial issue, was of much more direct concern to Egyptian workers who had never used the name *Schistosoma*. He recognised that the balance of opinion was in favour of validating the entry of the name *Schistosoma* on the "Official List." Nevertheless, this was not a proposal which he could support, and he would feel bound to vote against it.

THE COMMISSION, Professor Mansour dissenting, agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—
    (a) to suppress for the purposes of Article 25 the generic name *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856 (Class Trematoda);
    (b) to validate the name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858 (Class Trematoda);

(2) to confirm the entry of the name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858, on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology";

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

Miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the " Regles " : fifth instalment

(*Previous reference: Paris Session,* 11*th Meeting, Conclusion* 7)

12. THE COMMISSION had before them a memorandum by the Secretary (Commission Paper I.C.(48)17) containing a fifth instalment of miscellaneous proposals received from various sources for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles*. For convenience of reference these proposals, which were 13 in number, had been numbered consecutively with the proposals brought forward in the paper containing the fourth instalment (Commission Paper I.C.(48)16). The present proposals were therefore numbered (81) to (93).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to examine Commission Paper I.C.(48)17, point by point, for the purpose of reaching conclusions regarding the recommendations to be submitted on the questions raised therein.

The plenary powers of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : use of, in relation to particular purposes

(*Previous reference: Paris Session,* 4*th Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

13. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352), set forth in Point (81) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17, that words should be inserted in the Article which, as agreed at the meeting noted in the margin, the Section on Nomenclature had been invited to propose to the Congress should be added to the *Règles* in regard to the plenary powers of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, the object of the words so proposed to be inserted in the foregoing Article being to draw the attention of the Commission to the need for giving special consideration to certain classes of applications designed to promote stability in nomenclature.

In the ensuing discussion there was general agreement in regard to the foregoing proposal, but the view was expressed that the scope of the proposal should be expanded to cover cases where the resuscitation of a long-forgotten type designation or type selection of a genus would lead to the sinking in synonymy of a well-known generic name or to an alteration of the manner in which such a name should be applied.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that in the Article to be added to the *Règles* relating to the grant of plenary powers to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature words should be inserted enjoining the Commission to give special consideration to applications for the use of the plenary powers in cases where the applications in question are concerned either (1) to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes some old long-forgotten or long-ignored work containing new names, the introduction of which would sink in synonymy names that are well established in current use, or (2) to suppress any long-ignored name, or in the case of a generic name, any long-ignored type designation or type selection where the acceptance of that name or, as the case might be, that type designation or type selection would in the first case sink in synonymy, or in the second case, sink in synonymy or alter the meaning to be attached to, some well-known name in current use.

The plenary powers of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : application to cases of doubt arising from impossibility of determining the species to which a given trivial name should apply

14. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted by the Secretary in Point (82) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17 that in the Article to be added to the *Règles* in regard to the grant of plenary powers to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature provision should be made not only to cover (as already agreed) cases where greater confusion than uniformity would result from the strict application of the *Règles* but also to cover those cases where, owing to the impossibility of determining to which of two or more species a given trivial name should be applied, a serious and irremediable state of confusion was inevitable unless the Commission were empowered to use their plenary powers definitely to select a given species to be the species to which the trivial name in question was to apply. It was explained that, although this proposal contemplated an extension of the plenary powers of the Commission, the extension proposed was concerned not with widening the field in which the Commission was empowered to authorise exceptions being made from the *Règles* but with providing a means by which the *Règles* could be strictly applied in those cases where, without the intervention of the Commission, the application of the *Règles* was impossible and doubt and confusion in nomenclature was inevitable.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that in the Article to be added to the *Règles* in regard to the plenary powers of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature there should be inserted words to make it clear that, included among the classes of case for which those powers may be used are cases where confusion exists and is likely to persist through the impossibility, in the absence of the use of such powers, of determining the species to which a given specific or subspecific trivial name should be applied.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : insertion in the "Règles" of an Article relating to composition of

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion 10)

15. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a note submitted by the Secretary in Point (83) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17, drawing attention to the fact that now that it had been decided to recommend the inclusion in the *Règles* of an Article relating to the functions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (Point (66) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16), it was necessary also to include an Article dealing with the composition of the Commission and the method of electing its members. The Article should be in general terms but should specify the principal decisions in this matter taken by the Congress.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should be inserted in the *Règles* a provision dealing in general terms with the composition of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the method of electing its members, this provision to specify all decisions in this regard taken by the present Congress and to provide, *inter alia:*—

(Previous reference Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion 1)

(a) that the Commission shall consist of such number of members, not being less than 18, as the Congress or the Commission acting on behalf of the Congress, may from time to time determine ;

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion 3)

(b) that one-third of the members of the Commission, being those members who have had the longest service as such since their election or, as the case may be, their most recent re-election as members of the Commission, shall vacate their membership of the Commission at each successive Congress and that the vacancies so created shall be filled by elections made by the Congress for such periods and subject to such conditions as may from time to time be determined by the Congress, members of the Commission vacating their position as such under the present section being eligible for immediate re-election by the Congress ;

(c) that the number of officers of the Commission, their titles and duties, shall be determined from time to time by the Congress and that, when at a meeting of the Congress, a member of the Commission who holds one of the said offices is one of the members of the Commission who, under (b) above, is required to vacate his membership, the office in question is to be deemed to have fallen vacant and shall be filled by the Congress by election from among the members of the Commission, the retiring officer, if re-elected to be a member of the Commission, being eligible for immediate re-election to the office so vacated by him, and further that, until the Congress otherwise determines the Officers of the Commission shall consist of a President, a Vice-President and a Secretary;

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion 2)

(d) that during periods between successive Congresses the Commission may, subject to (a) above, vary the number of members of the Commission and may, in the manner agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, elect zoologists to fill additional places so created, may fill casual vacancies which may occur in the membership of the Commission during such periods as the result of death, resignation or otherwise, such elections being made for such periods and subject to such conditions as the Commission may, subject to (b) above, from time to time determine, and may also, subject to (c) above, fill vacancies in the offices of the Commission which during such periods may arise by reason of any of the causes aforesaid;

(e) that, if, as the result of an emergency, it is not possible to hold a Congress at the appointed time, the Commission or the Executive Committee of the Commission, or failing which, the Secretary to the Commission, may assume and exercise such extraordinary powers as it or he may consider necessary to secure the continued existence of the Commission, provided :—

  (i) that the powers so assumed shall not include the power to vary the *Règles* or to render *Declarations* or *Opinions* on behalf of the Commission;

  (ii) that at the first Congress to be held after the end of such emergency the Commission shall submit a Report to the Congress regarding the extraordinary powers assumed during the emergency and the action taken by the Commission or, as the case may be, the Executive Committee or by the Secretary to the Commission thereunder;

(f) that, in filling places in the Commission, due regard is to be paid to the need for securing (i) that there is an appropriate balance in the membership of the Commission as between different parts of the world and (ii) that there is an appropriate representation of different types of knowledge and experience (1) in the various branches of the Animal Kingdom as respects both living and fossil species and also (2) of the needs of workers not only in the field of systematic zoology, including palaeozoology, but also in such of the applied fields as are concerned with biological subjects.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : insertion in the "Règles" of an Article relating to the By-Laws of

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion 10)

16. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a note submitted by the Secretary in Point (84) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17, drawing attention to the fact that now that it had been decided to recommend the inclusion in the *Règles* of an Article defining the functions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (Point (66) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16), it was necessary also to include an Article relating to the By-Laws of the Commission and specifying the extent to which the Commission was free to alter the provisions laid down therein.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* providing :—

(a) that the functions and composition of the Commission and its procedure and other matters concerned with the conduct of its affairs shall be governed by By-Laws to be adopted by the Commission, consisting in part of Organic Articles specifying those matters on which decisions have been taken by the Congress and in part of Articles dealing with other questions relating to the matters aforesaid ;

(b) that the Organic Articles to be incorporated in the By-Laws shall not be subject to change by the Commission, except that in so far as the Congress may from time to time vary the provisions in the *Règles* relating to the functions, composition and procedure of the Commisison, it shall be the duty of the Commission to amend the relevant Organic Articles to such extent as may be necessary to bring those Articles into harmony with the decisions so taken by the Congress ;

(c) that, in addition to, and subject to the provisions of, the Organic Articles, there may be included in the By-Laws such provisions as the Commission may deem to be necessary or expedient relating (i) to the election of officers during inter-Congress periods and the duties to be assigned to each such officer, (ii) to the election of members of the Commission, (iii) to the methods to be followed in voting on matters requiring decision, and (iv) generally to any other matter concerning the conduct of the business of the Commission ;

(d) that, subject to (b) above, the Commission may at any time vary its By-Laws to such extent and subject to such conditions as it may from time to time decide to be necessary or appropriate ;

(e) that it shall be the duty of the Commission to make arrangements with the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature (the corporation responsible for the conduct of all financial matters on behalf of the Commission) for the By-Laws of the Commission to be printed by the Trust and for supplies of the By-Laws, so printed, at all times to be held available for sale.

Article 28 relative merits of the "first reviser" and "page precedence principles : Report by the Secretary

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 24)

17. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a Report (Point (85) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17) prepared by the Secretary to the Commission in response to a request made to him at the meeting noted in the margin, on the subject of the relative advantages of the "first reviser" and "page precedence" principles in relation to names (whether generic or trivial) published in the same book or paper for the same genus or species and to a single name when applied in such circumstances to different genera or to different species.

In this Report the Secretary both summarised the existing position in this matter and drew attention to the diversity of practice among zoologists. The Secretary concluded that the first essential was to redraft Article 28 in such a way as to eliminate all doubt regarding the requirements of the *Règles* on this question. Owing to the lack of uniformity in existing practice, some inconvenience was inevitable for individual workers if a common practice was now to be obtained for names in all parts of the Animal Kingdom. There were two important considerations which should be borne in mind : first, the importance of selecting the solution which would be both the most satisfactory on merits and would also be likely to lead to the minimum of inconvenience and disturbance of existing practice ; second, the need for adopting measures to minimise the bad effects of such disturbance in existing practice as was inevitable, whatever solution was adopted. On the first of these points, the Secretary had reached the conclusion that the principle of page precedence was on merits greatly to be preferred to that of the first reviser, owing to the simplicity with which it could be applied, whereas in many cases the application of the second of these principles was a matter of difficulty and doubt; further, it appeared that a large and increasing number of zoologists were in fact already applying this principle, notwithstanding the present provisions of Article 28. On the second of the points to which he had drawn attention, the Secretary suggested that, where the adoption of the principle of page precedence would lead to hard cases, those hard cases should be met by the Commission through the use of their plenary powers.

A long discussion ensued on the Report submitted by the Secretary, in the course of which general support was expressed for the proposals submitted. Special consideration was given to the question whether the new provisions should be given retroactive effect or whether those provisions should apply only to those names, the relative status of which had not been determined under the existing provisions of Article 28 prior to a date to be specified in the *Règles*. It was realised, however, that, in view of the fact that a very large number of names were to-day treated as though the principle of page precedence were already enshrined in Article 28, a decision not to make the new provisions retroactive would fail to secure the desired object, for it would involve the widespread disturbance in existing nomenclatorial practice which it was the object of the Commission to avoid. Moreover, the lack of precision in the existing provisions of Article 28 in regard to the manner in which the "first reviser" principle was to be applied (for example, the difficulties often encountered in determining whether in a given work a given author had in fact acted as a first reviser) had led to doubt in many cases as to the way in which those provisions should be applied. On balance, therefore, it was felt that more harm than good would be done if the new provisions were to be brought into operation only as from some future date. At the conclusion of this part of the discussion, the Commission turned to consider the safeguards that could usefully be adopted to remedy the inconvenience arising from the disturbance in existing nomenclatorial practice in certain cases through the grant of retroactive effect to the principle of page precedence. It was generally agreed that it was desirable that there should be attached to the new provision a supplementary provision prohibiting the disturbance of existing practice, without the prior approval of the Commission, and recommending the

Commission to consider sympathetically applications for the use of their plenary powers in such cases to prevent disturbance of existing nomenclatorial practice, and, in particular, in the case of names of importance in medicine, agriculture, veterinary science and other applied fields of biology or in the teaching of zoology.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that in place of the provisions in Article 28 relating to names of the same date there be inserted in the *Règles* at an appropriate point provisions (a) that, where two or more names were published for the same taxonomic unit, or where the same name was published for more than one taxonomic unit, in the same book or serial or in the same part of any book or serial and were in consequence of identical date, the name printed on the earlier of the pages concerned is to have precedence over the name or names published on a later page, (b) that, where two or more such names are published on the same page, the name which appears on the line nearest to the top of the page is to have precedence over any name or names which appear lower down that page and (c) that, where two or more such names are printed in the same line, a name appearing earlier, is to have precedence over any name or names appearing later, in the same line ;

(2) that the provisions specified in (1) above should be subject to the following conditions :—

(a) that, where the application of the foregoing provision would lead to a change in the name of a taxonomic unit of importance, particularly in the fields of medicine, agriculture, veterinary science or other applied fields in biology or in the teaching of zoology, specialists may apply to the Commission for the use of its plenary powers to maintain existing nomenclatorial practice and that, on such an application having been submitted, no change in that practice should be made until the Commission's decision is made known ;

(b) that the said International Commission shall give sympathetic consideration to applications for the use of its plenary powers for the purpose of stabilising names, when requested to do so in accordance with (a) above ;

(3) that the existing *Recommandation* to Article 28, being inconsistent with the provisions now proposed to be inserted in that Article, should be deleted therefrom.

The use by the Commission of their plenary powers: supplementary provisions relating to procedure

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 3)

18. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (Point (86) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17) that there should be included in the Schedule which it had been agreed at the meeting noted in the margin should be established for the recording of decisions taken by the Commission under their plenary powers particulars also of decisions taken by the Commission refusing applications for the use of those powers. It was proposed also that provision should be made for the automatic repeal, for all except historical purposes, of *Opinions* recording decisions taken by the Commission under their plenary powers when those decisions were recorded in a Schedule to the *Règles.*

There was general agreement that it was desirable that it should be made clear in an appropriate Schedule to the *Règles* what was the position where the Commission had been asked to use their plenary powers to validate one name by suppressing another but had come to the conclusion that the circumstances did not warrant the use of their plenary powers for the purpose in question. The view was expressed, however, that it was undesirable in such a case that the Commission should stop short by giving a negative decision of this kind. The proper course, it was felt, was that the Commission should in such a case take a positive decision on the issue involved by stating in their *Opinion* what was the name which should be used under the *Règles*, that name being at the same time added to the appropriate "Official List." It was this decision which should be recorded in the appropriate Schedule.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, when in future the Commission refused to grant an application for the use of their plenary powers to validate a given name by suppressing another name, the *Opinion* to be rendered should not only record the refusal of the Commission to use their plenary powers in the manner proposed but should also state clearly what was the name which under the *Règles* should be used in the case in question ;

(2) to recommend :—

(a) that the provisions governing the use of the plenary powers should be amended to provide as specified in (1) above ;

(b) that, whenever a decision, whether validating or suppressing a given book, or a given name, was inscribed in the Schedule to the *Règles* which at the meeting noted in the margin it had been agreed to establish for the recording of such decisions, the *Opinion* in which that decision had originally been promulgated should be repealed for all except historical purposes;

(3) to invite the Secretary to the Commission to examine every *Opinion* so far rendered, in which an application for the use of the plenary powers had been rejected, with a view to the submission by him of proposals for the completion by the Commission of the decisions so recorded, where those decisions did not comply with the requirements specified in (1) above.

Decisions in regard to individual books or names taken by the Commission otherwise than under their plenary powers: record of, to be made in a Schedule to the "Règles"

(*Previous references: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 3; *9th Meeting, Conclusion* 31)

19. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (Point (87) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17) that the decisions already taken during the present Session for the recording in Schedules to the *Règles* of decisions embodied in certain *Opinions* rendered by the Commission should be extended in such a way as to secure that every decision given in an *Opinion* rendered by the Commission in regard to the status of a given book or name or nomenclatorial usage (e.g. the determination of the type species of a given genus) should be recorded in an appropriate Schedule to the *Règles*. It had already been agreed at the Fourth Meeting of the Paris Session that all such decisions whether validating or suppressing a given book, name or usage taken by the Commission under its plenary powers should be so recorded, while at the Ninth Meeting of the same Session it had been agreed that a similar record should be made of every decision where the Commission ruled that a given book or name was not available under the *Règles*. In order to complete the system of record so begun, it was desirable that there should be recorded in the appropriate Schedule a record of every affirmative decision taken by the Commission, otherwise than under their plenary powers, i.e. every decision that a given book or name was available under the *Règles*. It was proposed also that, on the transfer to the Schedule concerned of any decision relating to the status, whether available or unavailable, of a given book or name, the *Opinion* in which that decision had originally been promulgated should be repealed for all except historical purposes.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that the decision taken at the Ninth Meeting of their Paris Session that there should be established a Schedule in which should be recorded every decision taken by the Commission that a given book or a given name was not available under the *Règles* (that is to say every such decision other than a decision taken by the Commission under their plenary powers) should be extended in such a way as to provide also that every such decision, affirming that a given book or name or nomenclatorial usage was available under the *Règles* or, as the case may be, correct thereunder should be recorded in the said Schedule ;

(2) that, whenever a decision falling in the classes specified in (1) above was inscribed in the Schedule to the *Règles* concerned, the *Opinion* in which that decision had originally been promulgated should be repealed for all except historical purposes.

" Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " and " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " and corresponding Indexes of Rejected and Invalid Names : establishment of Schedules to the " Règles " for reception of

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusions* 41 *and* 42)

20. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (Point (88) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17) that two further Schedules should be added to the *Règles* for the reception respectively of the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " and the " Official List of Specific Names in Zoology," and matters consequential thereto.

There was general agreement that, now that (as agreed at the meeting noted in the margin) a provision was to be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing and defining the scope of the two " Official Lists," it was desirable that entries of names on those " Lists " should be formally recorded in the manner proposed. It was recalled that, since the present proposal had been drafted, the Commission had proposed, and the Section on Nomenclature had agreed, that the title of the second of these " Official Lists " should be changed to that of " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology." It would be necessary therefore to make a corresponding change in the decision to be taken on the present proposal.

The Commission were informed that, in the preparations which had already been made for the publication of the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " in book form there had been added to that " List " an " Index " of rejected and invalid names, giving particulars of all names which the Commission had either suppressed under their plenary powers or had declared were otherwise unavailable under the *Règles*. This course had been taken because it had been felt that it was only in this way that it would be possible to provide a readily accessible alphabetical list of such names. From the point of view of working zoologists a knowledge of decisions taken by the Commission either suppressing, or declaring invalid, individual names was just as important as a knowledge of the corresponding affirmative decisions. It was accordingly suggested that the Schedules now proposed to be established should be divided into two parts, the first part, in each case, for the reception of the "Official List" concerned, the second for the reception of the corresponding Index of rejected and invalid names.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that further Schedules should be added to the *Règles* for the reception respectively of the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" and the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" and that Indexes of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names and of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names should either be added to the respective Schedules concerned or should be recorded in further Schedules, whichever might be found the more convenient;

(2) that, in order to prevent the volume containing the *Règles* and the Schedules thereto already agreed to be established from becoming too bulky, the Schedules referred to in (1) above should be published separately from time to time in parts;

(3) that, on the forthcoming publication of the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" (already in the press), the volume so formed should constitute the first instalment of the relevant Schedule referred to above, and that, as from the date of the publication of that volume, all the *Opinions* rendered by the Commission in relation to names recorded in the Schedule concerned should be repealed for all except historical purposes;

(4) that, as and when sufficient further names should have been added to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" or to the "Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names" or should have been placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" or on the corresponding "Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names", further instalments in the first case and instalments in the second case should be added

to the appropriate Schedule and thereupon published as further instalments of the supplementary volumes of the *Règles*, as prescribed in (2) above and that the *Opinions* in which the decisions that the names in question should be placed on an Official List or Index, as the case might be, had been originally published should thereupon be repealed for all except historical purposes.

Incorporation in Schedules to the " Règles " of decisions given in " Opinions " : preliminary cancellation and amendment of certain " Opinions " already published

21. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (Point (89) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17) that, prior to the incorporation in Schedules to the *Règles* of decisions embodied in *Opinions* rendered by the Commission, certain of the *Opinions* in question should be cancelled, because they had either never been correct or were no longer correct, and that certain other of those *Opinions* should be amended in certain respects.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the undermentioned *Opinions* should, for the reasons severally specified below, be cancelled except for historical purposes :—

(a) *Opinion* 9 (" The use of the name of a composite genus for a component part requiring a name "), because it contained no effective decision ;

(b) *Opinions* 23 and 24 (" *Aspro* versus *Cheilodipterus* or *Ambassis* " and " *Antennarius* Commerson, 1798, and Cuvier, 1817, versus *Histrio* Fischer, 1813 "), the decision in each of which was incorrect, being based upon an erroneous interpretation of the expression " nomenclature binaire " as hitherto used in the *Règles;*

(c) *Opinion* 32 (" The type of the genus *Sphex* "), because it had been rendered superfluous and misleading by the later decision by the Commission in *Opinion* 180 to designate the type species of this genus under their plenary powers ;

(d) *Opinion* 44 (" *Leptocephalus* versus *Conger* "), because it had been rendered superfluous and misleading by the later decision taken by the Commission in *Opinion* 89 to suppress " Gronow, 1763 " under their plenary powers ;

(e) *Opinion* 74 (" Apstein's (1915) List of Nomina Conservanda "), because it dealt with a bygone question of procedure and not with nomenclature ;

(f) *Opinion* 133 ("*Urothoe* Dana and Phoxocephalidae Sars "), because the decision obscurely stated in that *Opinion* had later been stated with precision in *Opinion* 141 ;

(2) that, as regards *Opinion* 76 (" Status of *Pyrosoma* versus *Monophora; . . . Appendicularia* and *Fritillaria* "), the decision recorded in the second sentence of the " summary " should be preserved, but that the remainder of the *Opinion* should be cancelled, as being no longer correct and not suitable for incorporation in a Schedule to the *Règles;*

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 1)

(3) that, in view of the fact that the decision of principle enunciated in the first sentence of the " Summary " of *Opinion* 83 (" *Acanthiza pyrrhopygia* Vigors and Horsfield, 1827, versus *Acanthiza pyrrhopygia* Gould, 1848 ") was now to be clearly laid down in the *Règles*, there was no need to record in the Schedule to the *Règles* the now self-evident proposition set out in the second sentence and therefore that this *Opinion* should be cancelled except for historical purposes ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 26)

(4) that, on the incorporation in the *Règles* of the decision of principle recorded in the first sentence of the " Summary " of *Opinion* 88 (" *Otarion diffractum* versus *Cyphaspis burmeisteri* ") in the manner agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, the decision recorded in the second sentence of the " summary " should be preserved when the above *Opinion* was cancelled for all except historical purposes, subject to the substitution therein, of the word " available " for the word " valid," the former expression being one to be reserved for nomenclatorial considerations while the latter was to be reserved for taxonomic matters ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 46)

(5) that, on the incorporation in the *Règles*, and the consequent cancellation, of the interpretative portion of the first sentence of the " Summary " of *Opinion* 102 (" *Protocephala* Blainville, 1828, versus *Protocephalus* Weinland, 1858 ") in the manner agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, the remaining portion of this *Opinion*

should be cancelled, that portion being concerned not with nomenclature but with taxonomy ;

(6) that the decision regarding the name *Echinocyamus pusillus* Müller (O.F.), 1776, recorded in the last two lines of the " Summary " of *Opinion* 107 (" *Echinocyamus pusillus* versus *Echinocyamus minutus* ") should be entered in the appropriate Schedule to the *Règles* and the remainder of the *Opinion* cancelled ;

(7) that, on the incorporation in the appropriate Schedule of the decision embodied in *Opinion* 113 (" *Sarcoptes* Latreille, 1802, type *scabiei*, placed on the ' Official List ' "), the date given for the generic name *Sarcoptes* Latreille should be amended, that name dating from a year calculated according to the French Revolutionary Calendar and therefore in a period overlapping into two years calculated in accordance with the Christian era.

" Opinions " 31, 68, 69, 78, 99, 129 : supplementary decisions in regard to

22. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the first four of the six proposals relating to *Opinions* previously rendered by the Commission submitted in Point (90) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the erroneous decision in *Opinion* 31 in regard to the type species of the genus *Columbina* Spix should be cancelled and that there should be substituted therefor the amended decision suggested by the late Dr. Stejneger and published in 1911 (the year following the issue of the erroneous decision referred to above) as a footnote to the first page of *Opinion* 38 ;

(2) as regards *Opinion* 68 (" The type species of *Pleuronectes* Linnaeus, 1758 ") and *Opinion* 69 (" The type species of *Sparus* Linnaeus, 1758 ") :—

  (a) that the incomplete and unhelpful decisions given in the foregoing *Opinions* should be supplemented as soon as possible by *Opinions* specifying the type species of the genera concerned and placing the generic and trivial names concerned on the relevant " Official Lists " ;

  (b) that the Secretary to the Commission be invited to confer with specialists for the purpose of submitting proposals to the Commission to give effect to the decision recorded in (a) above ;

   (c) that on the publication of the supplementary *Opinions* referred to in (a) above, the decisions so rendered should be inserted in the appropriate Schedules to the *Règles* and *Opinions* 68 and 69 repealed for all except historical purposes ;

(3) that, as regards *Opinion* 97 (" Did Hübner's Tentamen, 1806, create monotypic genera ? "), the entry to be made in the appropriate Schedule should be that this leaflet was not published within the meaning of Article 25 and therefore that the new names which appeared therein did not acquire availability as from the date on which copies of that leaflet were distributed by its author ;

(4) as regards *Opinion* 78 (" Case of *Dermacentor andersoni* versus *Dermacentor venustus* ") and *Opinion* 99 (" *Endamoeba* Leidy, 1897, versus *Entamoeba* Casagrandi and Barbagallo, 1895 ") :—

   (a) that the decisions given in the foregoing *Opinions* should be reviewed by the Commission as soon as possible ;

   (b) that, pending the conclusion of the review referred to in (a) above, the decisions recorded in the foregoing *Opinions* should not be incorporated in the Schedules to the *Règles;*

   (c) that a statement should be issued announcing the decisions recorded in (a) and (b) above, stating that, pending the completion of the review specified in (a) above, the matters dealt with respectively in *Opinion* 78 and *Opinion* 99 are to be treated as being *sub judice*, and inviting specialists to communicate to the Commission their views on the action to be taken by way of confirming, modifying or reversing the decisions recorded in those *Opinions.*

Suppression of names under the plenary powers : principles to be followed

23. THE COMMISSION had under consideration (1) a proposal that the scope of the decision given in *Opinion* 129 to suppress the generic name *Bipinnaria* Sars, 1835, and certain other generic names published by that author should be clarified and (2) that the Commission should lay down for their future guidance the relative extent to which names should be suppressed under their plenary powers (*a*) when the object of suppressing a given name is to validate the later use of that name in some other sense, and (*b*) when the object of suppressing the name in question is to validate some other name (fifth and sixth proposals submitted in Point (90) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17).

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that there should be inserted in the Article embodying the plenary powers a provision prescribing that the following principles are to be followed by the Commission, when suppressing a generic name or a specific or other trivial name under those powers :—

(*a*) Where a name is suppressed for the purpose of validating the use, in some other sense, of the name in question as published at some later date, the name so suppressed is to be suppressed absolutely, so far as concerns its publication by the author, and in the work, cited at the time of its being suppressed, that is to say a name so suppressed is to be suppressed both for the purposes of Article 25 (Law of Priority) and for the purposes of Article 34 (in the case of a generic name) and Article 35 (in the case of a trivial name) (Law of Homonymy) ;

(*b*) Where a name is suppressed for the purpose of validating some later name given to the same taxonomic unit, the name in question is to be suppressed for the purposes only of Article 25 (Law of Priority) and is to retain its rights under Article 34 (in the case of a generic name) and Article 35 (in the case of a trivial name) (Law of Homonymy) ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

(2) that the principles specified in (1) above are to be applied retrospectively to decisions already taken by the Commission for the suppression of names under their plenary powers, before the decisions in question were recorded in the appropriate Schedule to the *Règles* in the manner agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin.

Schedules to the " Règles " : procedure to be followed in the transfer thereto of decisions recorded in " Opinions " rendered by the Commission

24. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal, submitted in Point (91) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17, in regard (1) to the method to be adopted in citing names when entries in regard thereto were transferred from *Opinions* to the appropriate Schedule of the *Règles* and (2) to the procedure to be followed in correcting any errors in *Opinions* on questions of fact which might be detected in the course of such transfer.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to invite the Secretary to the Commission as soon as possible after the conclusion of the present Congress (a) to examine in detail (i) the *Opinions* so far rendered by the Commission and (ii) the *Official Record of the Proceedings of the Commission* during its present Session, and (b) on the basis of that examination, to construct for insertion in the *Règles*, as amended by the present Congress, the Schedules recording decisions taken by the Commission in regard to individual books and individual names, which it had been agreed to attach to the *Règles* so amended ;

(2) that, when, in accordance with (1) above, any name on which a decision had been taken by the Commission was so placed in a Schedule to the *Règles*:—

(*a*) the name so transferred should be correctly cited and there should be inserted the bibliographical reference to the place of publication of that name and, in the case of a generic name, the bibliographical reference both to the place where the name of the type species was first published and to the place where that species was designated, indicated or selected to be the type species of the genus in question ;

(*b*) in the case of a specific trivial name, the generic name, in combination with which that name was originally published (a particular commonly omitted from the *Opinions* rendered by the Commission) should be inserted ;

(3) that, if, when the Secretary to the Commission re-examined the *Opinions* rendered by the Commission with a view to the transfer of their contents to the Schedules to the *Règles*, that Officer were to find errors or obscurities additional to those dealt with in Conclusions 21 and 22 of the present Meeting, he should at once submit particulars of the cases concerned to the Commission and that the Commission should treat as a matter of urgency the correction of such errors, in order to avoid any unnecessary delay in the publication of the *Règles* as revised by the present Congress and to this end should eliminate all procedural delays, if necessary under suspension of the By-laws.

"Official List of Generic Names in Zoology": gender of generic names to be specified in

25. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal, submitted in Point (92) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17, that there should be inserted in the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" a statement of the gender of every name placed on that "List."

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that the provisions relating to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" to be inserted in the *Règles* should prescribe *inter alia*:—

(a) that every *Opinion* rendered hereafter in which a name or names were added to the said "Official List" should specify the gender of the name or names concerned ;

(b) that, when any instalment of the Schedule containing the foregoing "Official List", is published, there should be added thereto an alphabetical list of all the names comprised therein and that against each generic name so recorded should be specified its gender.

Revision of the "Règles" by the Paris Congress: arrangements to be made for early promulgation and entry into force

26. THE COMMISSION had under consideration proposals (Point (93) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17) in regard to the arrangements to be made for the early promulgation and consequent entry into force of the revision of the *Règles* carried through by the present (Paris) Congress.

There was complete agreement in the discussion which took place on the foregoing proposals that it was of the utmost importance that the text of the *Règles*, as revised by the present Congress, should be promulgated and brought into operation at the earliest possible moment. Working zoologists all over the world would quickly learn that valuable improvements had been made in the *Règles* at the Paris Congress ; they would be anxious to secure the benefit of those improvements in their current work but would not be able to do so until the revised text had been promulgated. As suggested in the present proposal, such zoologists would however be able to guide themselves in their work even before the revised text of the *Règles* was available as soon as the detailed record of the Paris decisions was made available by the publication of the Minutes of the Paris Session in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature.* Every possible effort should therefore be made to expedite the publication of this record. Zoologists had had to wait far too long already for the reform of the *Règles* and now that an important step in that direction had at last been made, it was essential that every worker should be able to take advantage of the progress so made at the earliest possible moment.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the Minutes of the meetings of the Commission during their Paris Session should be so drafted as to give a full and detailed account of the decisions taken during that Session and that these Minutes, together with the supporting documents in the light of which many of those decisions had been taken and also the Reports to be submitted by the Commission to the present (Paris) Congress at its final Plenary Session, should be published as soon as possible in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature;*

(2) to recommend :—

(*a*) that, when the documents specified in (1) above were published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in the manner there prescribed, they should be prefaced by a short note explaining the arrangements in hand for the early publication of the revised *Règles* and advising all zoologists thenceforward to guide themselves in their work by reference to the decisions recorded in the Minutes of the meetings of the Commission and thus proceed as though the revised *Règles* were already published ;

(*Previous reference : Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 12)

(*b*) that the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature (the corporate body charged with the duty of undertaking all financial work on behalf of the Commission) should be requested in the name of the Congress to publish the revised text of the *Règles*, as soon as that text had been approved in the manner which had been agreed upon, and that the *Règles*, as revised by the Paris Congress, should formally enter into force as from the date on which they are so published ;

(*c*) that an Article should be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing the date of their entry into force as from the date specified in (*b*) above.

Miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the " Règles " : sixth instalment

27. THE COMMISSION had before them a memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission (Commission Paper I.C.(48)18) containing a sixth instalment of miscellaneous proposals received from various sources for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles*. For convenience of reference, these proposals, which were ten in number, had been numbered consecutively with the proposals brought

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 12)

forward in the paper containing the fifth instalment (Commission Paper I.C.(48)17). The present proposals were therefore numbered (94) to (103).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

> to examine Commission Paper I.C.(48)18, point by point, for the purpose of reaching conclusions regarding the recommendations to be submitted on the questions raised therein.

Article 35 (a trivial name not to be rejected as a homonym where two species having that name are placed in different genera which, through the accident of undetected generic homonymy, bear the same generic name)

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 1)

28. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a note submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in Point (94) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)18, further regarding the provisions to be inserted in the *Règles* in the Articles which it had been agreed at the meeting noted in the margin should replace the existing text of Article 35 relating to specific homonymy. The question raised by the Secretary was concerned with the status of a specific trivial name in a case where two species having identical trivial names were either originally described, or subsequently placed, in different genera but where those genera, through the accident of an undetected generic homonymy, bore the same name as one another.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that, when the Commission had considered this matter in relation to the proposals submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)8, they had reached the conclusion, though with some hesitation, that on balance it was desirable that in a case of the kind under discussion the later published of the two identical specific names should be rejected as a homonym of the earlier published name. Since the meeting at which this conclusion had been reached, Commissioner Chester Bradley had suggested that it would be well if this matter were further considered by the Commission. As a preliminary to such further consideration, he (the Acting President) had re-examined the issues involved, and, as the Commission would see from the note which he had circulated, he had come to the conclusion that this type of case should be treated as falling within the field of generic homonymy (Article 34) rather than that of specific homonymy (Article 35). He accordingly suggested that the Commission should modify the view which they had previously taken in this matter and should recommend the Congress to approve an alternative proposal under which a specific or subspecific name would not be liable to rejection as a homonym in a case where two species or subspecies were originally described, or subsequently placed, in different genera, which, however, through the accident of undetected generic homonymy, bore the same generic name. If this recommendation commended itself to the Commission, the desired end could be secured by modifying the definitions proposed to be given to the expressions " primary homonym " and " secondary homonym " respectively. In order, however, to prevent the risk of any misunderstanding in this matter, it might be advantageous to include in the *Règles* an express provision on this subject, even though this would not really be necessary if the foregoing definitions were amended in the sense suggested.

IN A SHORT DISCUSSION which ensued, general agreement was expressed with the proposal submitted, it being felt that it would be ritualistic to treat a specific name as a homonym in a case where that species had never been placed in a genus containing a species having the same trivial name, the existence of an older identical binominal combination as the specific name for another species being due solely to an undetected case of generic homonymy.

THE COMMISSION :—

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 1)

(1) agreed to substitute for the recommendation agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin in regard to the status to be accorded under the *Règles* to the name of a species or subspecies having a trivial name identical with that of another species or subspecies which, though not originally described, or subsequently placed, in the same genus, was so described or placed in a genus which, through the accident of undetected generic homonymy, bore the same generic name, a recommendation for the insertion in the *Règles* of a provision which would secure that in such a case the later published of the two trivial names should not be rejected on grounds of homonymy with the earlier published name ;

(2) agreed, in view of (1) above, to recommend :—

(a) that the reference to cases of apparent specific homonymy arising from an undetected generic homonymy should be deleted from :—

(i) the definition of the expressions " primary homonym " and " secondary homonym " recommended for insertion in the *Règles* under Section (2) of the First Conclusion adopted by the Commission at the Sixth of the

Meetings held during their Paris Session;

(ii) the Section of the foregoing Conclusion numbered (18);

(b) that the section of the conclusion referred to in (a)(i) above, numbered (11) should be deleted;

(c) that there should be inserted at an appropriate point in the *Règles* a provision that, where two species or subspecies bearing identical trivial names are either originally described, or subsequently placed, in different genera which, through the accident of undetected generic homonymy, bear or formerly bore the same generic name, the later published of the two trivial names is not to be rejected on grounds of homonymy with the earlier published trivial name an example being cited.

Article 25, Proviso (*a*) (meaning of the expression " indication " in relation to generic and trivial names): amplification of previous decision relating to

29. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by the Secretary (Point (95) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)18) that a slight amplification should be made in the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin to codify the decision relating to the interpretation of the expression " indication " as used in Proviso (a) to Article 25 in its relation to specific names given by the Commission in their *Opinion* 1. Through an inadvertence in the drafting of that *Opinion*, a trivial name published as a substitute for a previously published trivial name would be held to have been published with an " indication " even if the name so replaced had been a *nomen nudum*. Similar considerations applied to generic names so published.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 21*)

that their recommendation agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin regarding the incorporation in Article 25 of the interpretation of the expression " indication " as used in Proviso (a) to that Article in relation to specific trivial names should be amplified by the insertion of words to make it clear that a trivial name published as a substitute for an earlier but invalid trivial name is to be treated as having been published with an " indication ", only if the name so replaced had itself been published with a description or definition or indication and that a corresponding provision should be inserted in Article 25 in relation to generic names similarly published.

Article 30 (species eligible for selection as the type species where no nominal species was distinctly referred to the genus by its original author): amplification of previous decision relating to

30. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by the Secretary (Point (96) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)18) that a slight amplification should be made in the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin to insert in Article 30 words to give effect to the ruling given in the last sentence of the " Summary " of *Opinion* 46 on the subject of the species to be regarded as the type species of a genus originally published with no nominal species distinctly referred to it. Through an inadvertence in the drafting of this portion of *Opinion* 46, the decision there given was incomplete, for, although that *Opinion* provided for the case where some later author placed one but not more than one species in such a genus, it contained no provision for the case where the first subsequent author to place a species in such a genus placed in it two or more species.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 39)

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that their recommendation agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin regarding the insertion in the *Règles* of words to make it clear what species should be regarded as the type species of a genus originally established with no nominal species distinctly referred thereto should be amplified by the insertion of words providing that, where the first subsequent author to refer such species to such a genus referred to it two or more such species and did not designate or indicate one of those species to be the type species, the species so referred become for the purposes of Article 30 the sole originally included species, from which alone therefore the type species of the genus may be selected by a subsequent author.

Article 30 (clarification of certain ambiguities in)

31. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the position as regards the selection of a species to be the type species of a nominal genus which arose in cases where the author selecting that species referred not to the occasion on which the generic name in question had first been published in conditions which satisfied the requirements of Articles 25 and 26 of the *Règles* but to some other occasion on which the name in question had been published either prior to 1758 or subsequent both to 1757 and to the date on which the name was first validly published within the meaning of the Articles of the *Règles* referred to above, together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in Point (97) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)18. It was pointed out that in the case of the earlier generic names, later authors in the XIXth century when selecting type species, had not infrequently attributed those names either to the wrong author or to some work by the correct author other than that in which he first validly published the name in question, with the result, in either case, that the originally included species (from which alone the type species could be selected) might not be, and often in fact were not, the same as those placed in the genera concerned, when the generic names in question were first validly published. It was proposed that words should be inserted in Article 30 to make clear the position in this matter. Again, in some cases, authors, when selecting the type species of a genus, the name of which had first been published before 1758 (i.e. prior to the starting point of zoological nomenclature, as defined by Article 26), had attributed that name to the work of some author which had been published before the year 1758. In this class of case also the effect was to give the appearance of eligibility for selection as the type species of the genus in question to species, which had not been included in the genus at the later date subsequent to 1757 when the generic name was first published in conditions which satisfied the requirements of Articles 25 and 26, and which therfore were in fact ineligible for being so selected. Rule (g) in Article 30 expressly laid it down that that rule was to be applied " rigorously ", and it could not be claimed that this injunction had been complied with, when a type selection was based upon the use of the generic name in question in some work other than that in which it was first validly published. Still less could it be claimed that the foregoing provision in Rule (g) had been complied with, when the type selection was based upon the use of the generic name in question prior to 1758, i.e. before the starting point of zoological nomenclature. It was proposed that words should be inserted in Article 30 to make it clear that this kind of procedure did not comply with the requirements of Rule (g) in Article 30 and accordingly that any type selection so made was to be rejected.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear :—

(a) that Article 30 relates only to the designation, indication or selection of the type species of a nominal genus published subsequent to 31st December, 1757, that is to say to the name of a genus as originally published subsequent to the above date by a given author in a given work, and that the action then taken by that author is alone relevant to the question :—

(i) of what species are to be regarded as having been originally included in the genus concerned for the purposes of Rules (e), (f) or (g) in the foregoing Article ; or

(ii) of whether the type species of the genus in question is to be treated as having been designated under Rules (a), (b), (c) or (d) of the foregoing Article at the time of the original publication of the generic name concerned ;

(b) that no selection of the type species for a given nominal genus, which is related to any publication of the name of that genus other than its first valid publication by its author or, as the case may be, the first subsequent such publication in which one or more species were distinctly referred to the genus so named, is to be accepted as a selection of the type species of that genus for the purposes of Rule (g) in Article 30.

Subspecific trivial names : position where, on being first published, such a name is preceded by a serial letter or by a serial numeral

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 14)

32. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the position of subspecific trivial names originally published in lists in which they were preceded by serial letters (file Z.N.(S.)352), submitted in Point (98) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)18. It was desirable that it should be made clear in the *Règles* that, where a subspecific trivial name was published in the foregoing circumstances, the serial letter by which it was preceded, when originally published, did not form part of the name in question.

It was pointed out that this proposal did no more than apply to the trivial names of subspecies the decision already taken in regard to the trivial names of species. As in the case of the latter class of name, the decision now to be taken should apply to names preceded by serial numerals as well as to names preceded by serial letters.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where a subspecific name was first published in a list in which the trivial name of the subspecies was preceded by either a serial letter or a serial numeral, that letter or numeral did not form part of the trivial name in question.

Revision of the " Règles " by the Paris Congress : date of entry into force

33. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) explained that the next Point in Commission Paper I.C.(48)18 (namely Point (99)) had been inserted by inadvertence, the question of the date of entry into force of the *Règles* as revised by the present Congress (with which

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 26*)

this Point was concerned) having been dealt with in the earlier Point (93) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17. The Commission had now taken a decision on the question raised in Point (93) and in consequence no action was required on Point (99).

THE COMMISSION took note of the above statement.

Article 34 and " Opinion " 116 (position as regards homonymy of generic names differing from one another only by the terminations "nus" and "-mus")

34. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 34 (relating to generic homonymy) and *Opinion* 116 (which laid it down that two generic names differing from one another by having in the one case the termination " *-nus* " and in the other case the termination " *-mus* " were not to be regarded as being homonyms of one another) and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in Point (100) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)18.

In the discussion of this question the view was expressed that it was not necessary or desirable to insert in the *Règles* provisions recording negative decisions such as that given in *Opinion* 116, in view of the fact that it had been agreed to recommend that words should be inserted in Article 34 to make it clear that the list of differences in spelling which were to be ignored in determining whether one generic name was a homonym of another which (through the codification of the decision given in *Opinion* 147) was now to be inserted in that Article was an exhaustive list. Thus, it followed automatically that generic names which differed from one another in spelling in any way not specified in that list were not to be treated as being homonyms of one another.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 43*)

(1) that, having regard to the fact that the list of differences in spelling in generic names which, at the meeting noted in the margin, it had been agreed should be inserted in Article 34 was to be treated as an exhaustive list, no advantage would be served by inserting in the *Règles* express provisions regarding differences in spelling which were not to be regarded as making one generic name a homonym of another ;

(2) that, in view of the decision on the question of principle involved recorded in (1) above, the interpretation of Article 34 given in *Opinion* 116 was now superfluous and therefore that the portion of that *Opinion* containing that interpretation should now be repealed for all except historical purposes.

Article 25 (status of a name first published in a work rejected for nomenclatorial purposes): amplification of previous decision

(*Previous references: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusions* 47 *and* 18)

35. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by the Secretary (in Point (101) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)18) that the decision taken by the Commission when incorporating in the *Règles* the ruling given by the Commission in *Opinion* 145 (on the status of generic names and specific trivial names when those names are first published in works rejected for nomenclatorial purposes) (a problem discussed in paragraph 45 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11) should be amplified to bring it completely into line with the decision previously taken at the same meeting to incorporate in the *Règles* the ruling given by the Commission in *Opinion* 4 (regarding the status of manuscript names) (a problem discussed in paragraph 12 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11) by making it clear that, until such names are (i) validly published and (ii) so published with an indication, their status is exactly the same as that of a manuscript name.

PURCHASED
26 JUN

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

> that their recommendation for the incorporation in the *Règles* of the ruling given in *Opinion* 145 (Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 47) should be amplified to make it clear that, where a name is first published in a work rejected for nomenclatorial purposes, that name, until (i) validly published and (ii) so published with an indication, has a status identical with that of a manuscript name, that is to say the status specified in the ruling given in *Opinion* 4, which it had already been agreed should be incorporated in the *Règles* (Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 18).

Article 25 (status of a generic name when first published in a specific synonymy)

36. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the question of the status of a generic name first published as the generic component of a binominal combination constituting a specific name cited in a specific synonymy, together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in Point (102) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)18.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 24)

It was pointed out that generic names originally published by pre-1758 authors and quoted as part of a specific name by post-1757 authors when giving specific synonymies were already ruled out by the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin to incorporate in the *Règles* the ruling given in *Opinion* 5, for a pre-1758 generic name so published after 1757 was neither adopted nor accepted by the author by whom it was so republished. There were two other classes of generic names which might appear in a specific synonymy, namely (1) a name published after 1757

THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, have great pleasure in expressing their grateful thanks to the UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION (U.N.E.S.C.O.) for the financial assistance afforded towards the cost of producing the present volume.

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Notice to subscribers regarding the arrangements made for the completion of volume 1 and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5

The following arrangements have been made for completing volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5 :—

Volume 1 : A concluding Part (Part 12), containing, *inter alia*, the Title Page, Table of Contents, and alphabetical subject index, will be published shortly.

Volume 2 : This volume, like Volume 1, will be devoted to the publication of applications in regard to nomenclatorial problems submitted by specialists to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. Publication will commence at an early date.

Volume 3 : This volume, which is now complete in 9 Parts, is devoted to the publication of the memoranda, reports and other documents considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at their meetings held in Paris in July 1948.

Volume 4 : This volume is devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July* 1948. Twenty-one Parts have been published and this volume is now complete except for the index which will be published in a concluding Part.

Volume 5 : At the request of the Bureau of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, this volume will be devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July* 1948, together with the Reports submitted to the Congress by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature.

INQUIRIES

All inquiries regarding publications should be addressed to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, and all inquiries regarding the scientific work of the Commission to the Secretary to the Commission at the following addresses :—

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7, England.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : Secretariat of the Commission, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.

Printed in Great Britain by Metchim and Son, Ltd., Westminster London

VOLUME 4. Parts 13/15
pp. 351—446.

9th June, 1950

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

PURCHASED
23 JUN 19

BRITISH MUSEUM NATURAL HISTORY

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

CONTENTS :

The Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July 1948 :

Page
Conclusions of Twelfth Meeting (*concluding instalment*) 351—353
Conclusions of Thirteenth Meeting 354—424
Conclusions of Fourteenth Meeting (*first instalment*) 425—446

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948,

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature at the Publications Office of the Trust 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1950

Price One pound, eight shillings.

(*All rights reserved*)

by a non-binominal author and not validly republished by a binominal author prior to being cited in a specific synonymy and (2) a name which previously had existed only as a manuscript name or as a *nomen nudum*. Names of genera accidentally introduced into the literature in this way were usually ignored and it was desirable that official sanction should now be given to this practice.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted in Article 25 to make it clear that a generic name is not to be treated as having been published with an indication by virtue only of its having been published as the generic component of a specific name cited in a synonymy given for a nominal species, and accordingly that a generic name so published does not thereby acquire any status in zoological nomenclature.

Article 30 (question of the type species of a genus, the name of which was first published in a generic synonymy), Report by Secretary asked for

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 24)

37. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the question of the application to generic names published in generic synonymies of the provisions of Article 30, together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in Point (103) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)18.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 18)

It was pointed out that, under the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin (by which the ruling given in *Opinion* 5 was to be incorporated in the *Règles*) a generic name originally published before 1758 did not acquire any rights under the Law of Priority (Article 25) when after 1758 it was republished in a generic synonymy, for publication in this manner did not constitute either adoption or acceptance by the author by whom the name was so published. There remained however the case of manuscript generic names which first appeared in print after 1758 in generic synonymies. These names were in a position similar to that of manuscript trivial names, the position of which had been clarified by *Opinion* 4 (the ruling in which it had been agreed at the meeting noted in the margin should now be incorporated in the *Règles*). There was however an essential difference in this matter between a manuscript trivial name first published in a specific synonymy on the one hand and a manuscript generic name first published in a generic synonymy on the other. For the manuscript trivial name, on being so published, could apply only to the same species as the nominal species of which it was published as a synonym. On the other hand, a genus established without a designated type species is indeterminate until its type species has been selected under Rule (*g*) (or exceptionally under Rule (*e*)) in Article 30. What species should therefore be treated as the type species of a genus, when its name, after having existed first as a manuscript name (or a *nomen nudum*) was published in a generic synonymy ? Was the type species of such a genus automatically the same species as the type species of the nominal genus, of which the generic name in question had been published as a synonym ? Or was it an independent generic unit, for which a later author was free to select as the type species any of the species included in the genus to which the generic name in question was sunk as a synonym at the time of its first publication ? The question was a difficult one, for it often happened that, where a manuscript generic name "A" was first published as a synonym of a previously published generic name "B," the species on that occasion referred to the genus having the name "B" were different, in whole or in part, from those placed in that genus at the time when the generic name "B" was itself first published. These and other complicated aspects of the problem needed to be carefully examined before a decision was reached. It was thought desirable therefore that no decision should be taken at the present Session, but that an inquiry should be put in hand at once, so that a final decision could be taken by the Commission at its meeting to be held at the next (XIVth) Congress.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that the Secretary to the Commission should be invited to make a thorough study, in conjunction with interested specialists, of the problems relating to the determination of the type species of a genus, the name of which was first published in the synonymy of some other genus, and to submit a comprehensive Report thereon, with recommendations, for consideration by the Commission at their meeting to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress, with a view to the submission by the Commission to the Congress of recommendations for the insertion in the *Règles* of appropriate provisions dealing with the above matter.

Thirteenth meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session : time appointed

38. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) suggested that, as the Commission and the Section had completed their examination of the proposals in regard to the amendment and clarification of the *Règles* submitted in the series of Commission Papers ending with Commission Paper I.C.(48)18, they should adjourn for a short break. He suggested that the Commission and the Section should meet again for their next joint meeting (which would be the Thirteenth Meeting of the Commission and the Fifth Meeting of the Section) at 1730 hours. The first matter to be considered when the Commission resumed would be the proposals in regard to eight individual nomenclatorial problems submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48) 19.

After general concurrence in the foregoing proposal had been expressed both by the members of the Commission and by the members of the Section, THE COMMISSION agreed to adjourn until 1730 hours the same afternoon.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned at* 1635 *hours.*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 21st-27th July, 1948.

CONCLUSIONS of the Thirteenth Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July, 1948 at 1730 hours.

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Fifth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature*)

PRESENT:

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Professor K. Mansour (Egypt)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present:

M. Belloc (France)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (U.S.A.)
Dr. Isabel Gordon (United Kingdom)
Professor E. R. Hall (U.S.A.)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Dr. H. H. J. Nesbitt (Canada)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ethelwynn Trewavas (United Kingdom)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*

Eight individual problems of nomenclature raised in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19: procedure in regard to

1. THE COMMISSION had before them Commission Paper I.C.(48)19, containing proposals in regard to eight individual nomenclatorial problems.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

> to examine in turn each of the eight proposals relating to individual problems of zoological nomenclature submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19, for the purpose of reaching conclusions in regard thereto.

" Opinions " rendered without including an answer to all the points raised : arrangements for completion of

2. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the problem created by the fact that in the past *Opinions* had sometimes been rendered dealing with part only of the application submitted to the Commission in the case concerned, and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in Point (1) in Commission Paper I.C.(48) 19. In the case of *Opinion* 82, to which attention had been drawn by Commissioner Boschma (file Z.N.(S.)201) the issue of the *Opinion* in an incomplete form appeared to have been due solely to inadvertence, for no issue of principle of any kind was raised by the question which had been omitted. In the case of *Opinion* 95, to which attention had been drawn by Professor Harold Kirby (file Z.N.(S.)245), the omission had been deliberate and had been stated to be due to a desire to provide further opportunity for consideration of the issues involved. In this case, the issue of an *Opinion* dealing with part only of an application was not open to objection ; what was a matter for criticism was that no action of any kind was ever taken subsequently to deal with the portion of the application on which a decision had been postponed.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note, with disapproval, of the practice by which in the past an *Opinion* had sometimes been rendered which dealt with part only of the application submitted, no decision having been taken either then or at a later date on the remainder of the application in question ;

(2) agreed to invite the Secretary to the Commission to examine all the *Opinions* so far rendered by the Commission, with a view to ascertaining every instance where part only of an application had been dealt with, and to submit proposals as soon as possible for the rendering, as a matter of urgency, of supplementary *Opinions* dealing with the questions left unanswered in the earlier *Opinions* concerned.

" Calliphora " Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) to be added to the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology ": decision completing " Opinion " 82

3. THE COMMISSION had before them the proposal submitted by Commissioner Boschma (file Z.N.(S.)201) and supported in Point (2) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19 that an *Opinion* supplementary to *Opinion* 82 should now be rendered dealing with the application for the addition of the generic name *Calliphora* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* which had been left undecided when *Opinion* 82 was rendered. The application was entirely non-controversial, once a decision had been taken (as it was in *Opinion* 82) on the type species of the genus *Musca*

Linnaeus, 1758, for the omission from that *Opinion* of a decision on the generic name *Calliphora* Robineau-Desvoidy could only be due to inadvertence.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to place the generic name *Calliphora* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) (type species by original designation: *Musca vomitoria* Linnaeus, 1758) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* and the trivial name *vomitoria* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Musca vomitoria*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;

(2) to render an *Opinion* setting out the decision recorded in (1) above.

" Mabuya " Fitzinger, 1826 (Class Reptilia) : correction in the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " of entry relating to : correction of error in " Opinion " 92

4. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted in Point (3) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19 that an *Opinion* should at once be rendered correcting the erroneous entry on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* in regard to the generic name *Mabuya* Fitzinger, 1826 (Class Reptilia), which had occurred as the result of a mistake in *Opinion* 92. In that *Opinion* the type species of this genus had been stated to be *Scincus sloani* Daudin, 1803, a species which had not been referred to the genus *Mabuya* by Fitzinger when he founded that genus. The type species of this genus was *Lacertus mabouya* Lacépède, 1788, by absolute tautonymy.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the statement that *Scincus sloani* Daudin, 1803 was the type species of *Mabuya* Fitzinger, 1826 (Class Reptilia) inserted in the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* as the result of a mistake in *Opinion* 92 should be deleted and that in its place there should be inserted a statement that the type species was *Lacertus mabouya* Lacépède, 1788, by absolute tautonymy.

(2) to place the trivial name *mabouya* Lacépède, 1788 (as published in the binominal combination *Lacertus mabouya* on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* setting out the decision recorded in (1) above.

" Porina " Walker, 1856 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) (proposed validation of, under the Commission's plenary powers) : rejection of proposal

5. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) a proposal submitted by Dr. J. T. Salmon (New Zealand) that the generic name *Porina* Walker, 1856 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), the name widely used for an important pasture pest in New Zealand, should be validated by the use by the

Commission of their plenary powers for the suppression of the older name *Porina* d'Orbigny, 1852 (Class Bryozoa) (file Z.N.(S.)194);

(b) a note on the foregoing proposal submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in Point (4) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19,(i) drawing attention to the fact that *Porina* d'Orbigny, 1852, was the name of a leading genus in the Class Bryozoa (Cretaceous Section), (ii) expressing the opinion that it would be wrong for the Commission to use their plenary powers to give relief to workers in one group of the Animal Kingdom if the adoption of that course were to cause confusion among, or inconvenience to, workers in another group, and (iii) recommending that for this reason the application specified in (a) above should be rejected.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to reject, for the reasons set out in Point (4) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19, the application referred to in (a) above that they should use their plenary powers to validate the generic name *Porina* Walker, 1856 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) by suppressing the generic name *Porina* d'Orbigny, 1852 (Class Bryozoa);

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 18)

(2) in conformity with the decision in regard to the procedure in cases where an application for the use of the plenary powers is rejected taken at the meeting noted in the margin, to place on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the oldest available name for the genus for which the invalid name *Porina* Walker, 1856, had been published, namely the generic name *Oxycanus* Walker, 1856 (type species, by selection by Kirby (1892, *Syn. Cat. Lep. Het.* : 892) : *Oxycanus australis* Walker, 1856);

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 20)

(3) in conformity with the decision in regard to the procedure to be adopted where the Commission either suppresses a generic name or rules that is invalid under the *Règles* taken at the meeting noted in the margin, to add the name *Porina* Walker, 1856 (type species, by monotypy: *Porina novaezealandiae* Walker, 1856), to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*;

(4) to place the specific trivial name *australis* Walker, 1856 (as published in the binominal combination *Oxycanus australis*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*;

(5) to render an *Opinion* setting out the decisions specified in (1) to (4) above.

" Flebotomus " Rondani, 1840 : (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) Emendation of name to " Phlebotomus "

6. THE COMMISSION had under consideration applications in favour of the emendation of the generic name *Flebotomus* Rondani, 1840 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) to " *Phlebotomus* " submitted independently by Professor C. T. Brues (U.S.A.) and by Dr. G. B. Fairchild and Dr. Marshall Hertig (Mexico) (file Z.N.(S.)169), together with a summary of the issues involved submitted by the Secretary in Point (5) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19. In addition, Dr. Fairchild had furnished also letters of support for the emendation of this name which he had received from Dr. A. da Costa Lima (Brazil) and from Dr. Alan Stone (U.S.A.). As is well known, this name is of great importance in medical literature, where it is almost invariably spelt with an initial " Ph- " and not " F-", the former spelling being also in general, though not in universal, use in systematic literature. As had been pointed out by Mr. William F. Rapp, Jr. (U.S.A.), this generic name had been originally published by Rondani (in 1840) with an initial letter " F-", it not having been until 1846 that this spelling had been emended to the " Ph-" spelling by Agassiz. Two questions were involved : (1) whether the original " F-" spelling was due to an error, in which case it should be emended to the " Ph-" spelling under Article 19 of the *Règles* ; (2) if the original spelling was intentional, was this a case where, in order to prevent confusion, the Commission should use its plenary powers to validate the commonly accepted " Ph-" spelling ?

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that, when in 1944 Mr. Rapp had first suggested in the journal *Science* that the original spelling of *Flebotomus* should be restored, it had appeared to him, as Secretary to the Commission, that this was exactly the type of change in a name of importance in applied biology which ought not to be made on technical nomenclatorial grounds until the issues involved had been submitted to, and considered by, the Commission, for such changes were incomprehensible to, and were resented by, workers in those fields and should certainly be avoided, if at all possible. He had accordingly published a note inviting specialists to respect the " Ph-" spelling until the Commission had been able to consider the whole matter. When later he had himself looked into the origin of the word on which this generic name was based, he had found that no proper examination of this matter had ever been made. The technical problems involved were complex and he had had to appeal to expert linguists and lexicographers for advice, As the result of these studies he had reached the conclusion that, from the standpoint of an educated Italian of the mid-XIXth century, such as Rondani, the "F-" spelling was correct and consequently that this was not a case which could properly be dealt with under Article 19 of the *Règles*. In view however of the importance of this name in medical literature, it seemed to him that a reversion to the spelling originally used by Rondani would lead to confusion outside systematic circles and was the type of name change which brought discredit on zoological nomenclature among workers who were not concerned with, or interested in, the minutiae of the rules adopted by zoologists for their own work. He accordingly commended to the favourable consideration of the Commission the request that the "Ph-" spelling of this name should be preserved by the Commission by the use of the plenary powers.

PROFESSOR L. DI CAPORIACCO (ITALY) said that, speaking both as a zoologist and as an Italian, he was strongly in favour of the maintenance of the "Ph-" spelling of this well-known name. He was surprised that any other course should have been suggested.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to emend to *Phlebotomus* the generic name originally published by Rondani in 1840 as *Flebotomus* (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) ;

(2) to place the generic name *Phlebotomus* Rondani, 1840 (type species : *Bibio papatasi* Scopoli, 1786, by monotypy) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* and the trivial name *papatasi* Scopoli, 1786 (as originally published in the binominal combination *Bibio papatasi*), on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* setting out the decisions recorded in (1) and (2) above.

"Papilio plexippus" Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) : determination of identity of, under the plenary powers

7. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by the late Dr. A. Steven Corbet (United Kingdom) that they should use their plenary powers to determine the identity of the species to which the name *Papilio plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), should be applied. Without such a ruling, there was no possibility of putting an end to the present state of confusion arising from the fact that this name was applied by all American and by many other lepidopterists to the common American Danaid species known in the United States as the "Monarch" but was used also by other lepidopterists for the common Indo-Oriental species of the same genus, to which the name *Papilio genutia* had been given by Cramer in 1779 and which was universally known as *Danaus genutia* (Cramer) by all those workers who applied the trivial name *plexippus* Linnaeus to the "Monarch" butterfly. This case was dealt with in the Commission's file Z.N.(S.)323, and a summary of the issues involved was given in Point (6) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19 now before the Commission.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, speaking as a lepidopterist, he considered it essential that a decision should be taken by the Commission in this matter, for the species *Papilio plexippus* Linnaeus was the type species of the well-known family DANAIDAE and the fact that that species was at present indeterminate was a cause of great confusion. There was no doubt that Linnaeus had included both the species concerned under the name *Papilio plexippus* in 1758; the short main description might refer to either species but the longer diagnosis could not apply to the North American "Monarch". On the other hand, Linnaeus had stated that this species occurred in North America and, in doing so, could only have been referring to the "Monarch". Later, moreover, he had elaborated this statement (in the *Mus. Lud. Ulr.*) by adding that he had received specimens from Peter Kalm, the Swedish naturalist who had collected for him in North America. On merits, therefore, it seemed to him (Commissioner Hemming) that the balance of the argument lay in favour of a decision that this name should apply to the American and not to the Indo-Oriental species. Looking at the question more generally, there were two reasons why he favoured a decision in this sense: (1) owing to its migratory habits a large non-systematic literature had accumulated in regard to this species. (2) it would be most confusing if the trivial name (*plexippus*) commonly applied to it were to be transferred to a closely allied species in the same genus, involving, as it would, exactly the type of name transfer which the Congress, when granting plenary powers to the Commission, had directed the Commission to prevent. It was to enable the Commission to deal adequately with cases of this type that the proposals set out in Point (82) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17 had been submitted by the Commission to, and had been approved by, the Section on Nomenclature at the present Congress. The use of those powers would involve the selection of a well-known and unmistakable figure of whatever species the Commission might direct to be the species to which the name *Papilio plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758, should apply. If the Commission were to decide in favour of the North American "Monarch", a suitable figure would be that which appeared as fig. 1 on plate 7 of Holland's

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 14)

"*Butterfly Book*" (revised edition issued in 1931), a work which was known to, and readily accessible to, every worker in this group.

MR. N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) supported the proposal that the Commission should use its powers to stabilise the manner in which this name should be used. The solution suggested would, he believed, be generally welcomed.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to direct that the trivial name *plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio plexippus*) should be applied to the American species figured as *Danais plexippus* by Holland (W. J.), 1931, *Butterfly Book* as figure 1 on plate 7 ;

(2) to place the trivial name *plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as originally published in the binominal combination *Papilio plexippus*), as determined in (1) above on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* setting out the decisions recorded in (1) and (2) above.

"Colymbus" Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves) (type species of) : determination of, with the minimum of further delay

8. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a note by the Secretary (submitted in Point (7) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19) summarising the history of the application for the determination of the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), which had been before the Commission for over twenty years (file Z.N.(S.)78).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, as the records of the Commission showed, the Commission had in the past deliberately adopted a dilatory policy in dealing with this matter for fear that, whatever decision might be given, an important group of ornithologists would be offended through being required to change their established practice. No more bankrupt or unwise policy could be imagined, for the delay which had been allowed to occur had greatly enhanced the difficulties inherent in any solution, for the issue now involved was not only the name of a well-known genus of birds but also the name of a Family and Order based upon that genus. These names could not properly be used both for the grebes and for the divers, and the longer that they were used indiscriminately for both these groups the greater would become both the confusion in ornithological literature and the difficulty of securing a return to uniformity. Serious-minded ornithologists, including Dr. Alexander Wetmore, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, were anxious to see the Commission face its responsibilities in this matter by rendering an *Opinion* stating what was the type species of this genus under the *Règles.* The Commission could not deal with this question during their present Session, for they would need first to be furnished with, and to study carefully, a comprehensive and objective examination of the nomenclatorial issues involved and of the arguments which had been adduced in favour of each of the two possible solutions. He hoped, however, that the Commission would place on record their determination to reach a decision on this case with the least further delay possible and should initiate such action as they might consider calculated to promote this end.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) agreed :—

(a) that it was important that a decision on the question of the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), should be taken with the least possible further delay ;

(b) that, in order to assist the Commission in taking a decision on the foregoing question, the delay in the consideration of which had been due less to its intrinsic difficulty than to its controversial character, it was desirable that the Commission should be furnished with a report on the issues involved prepared by a zoologist who was an authority on nomenclature but was not himself an ornithologist and who therefore had not had to prejudge this question in the course of his own work ;

(2) in view of (1)(b) above, invited Commissioner Francis Hemming to examine the question of what species was under the *Règles* the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), and to furnish a Report thereon at the earliest possible moment ;

(3) agreed to examine the issues involved and to reach a decision thereon immediately upon receipt of the Report referred to in (2) above.

Unnecessary delays in reaching decisions on individual nomenclatorial problems involving controversial, though not necessarily difficult, issues : need for the avoidance of

9. Arising out of the discussion on the question of principle raised at the end of Point (7) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19, recorded in Conclusion 8 above, THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note of, and disapproved, the unnecessary delays which had been allowed to occur in reaching a decision on the question of the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves) ;

(2) placed on record their conviction that, where an application relating to an individual nomenclatorial problem raised controversial, though not necessarily difficult, issues the deliberate adoption of procedures leading to unnecessary delays in reaching a decision was calculated both to prejudice the attainment of stability in the nomenclature of the group concerned and also to impair the authority and prestige of the Commission as an effective, impartial international tribunal ;

(3) affirmed their intention in future to avoid all unnecessary delays in reaching decisions on applications of the kind specified in (2) above and to give an answer to such questions promptly and without fear or favour.

Linnean system of binominal nomenclature not available for the nomenclature of monsters : generic and trivial names published for such purposes to have no status in zoological nomenclature

10. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) a communication received from Professor R. T. Leiper (United Kingdom) (file Z.N.(S.)285) drawing attention to the misuse of the Linnean system of nomenclature to denominate certain types of monster (1) by Gurlt (1832, *Lehrbuch der pathologischen Anatomie*), who had erected for various monsters a number of so-called " genera " (each given a Latin generic name), including one named " Schistosomus ", to which various so-called " species " (each given a Latin trivial name) were referred, (2) by Eisenbarth (1908, *Wschr. Tierheilk. Viehz.*) in publishing a description of a monster under the so-called " specific name " *Schistosoma reflexum*, and (3) by Notter (1927, in Virchow's *Arch. f. path. Anat.*) who had followed the same practice in a paper entitled "*Schistosomen beim Schwein* " ;

(b) a note on the above case submitted by the Secretary in Point (8) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19.

It was generally agreed that it was a misuse of the Linnean system of binominal nomenclature to apply it for the nomenclature of monsters. Such a use of the binominal system was particularly objectionable, when (as in the present case) one of the so-called generic names (*Schistosoma*) was identical with the name of a genus of the Animal Kingdom of great importance in an applied field of science (e.g. medicine). In this particular case, confusion had already arisen, the papers by Eisenbarth (1908) and Notter (1927) having appeared in a bibliography of Schistosomiasis.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to recommend that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that Latin names given to monsters possess no status in zoological nomenclature under the *Règles* and therefore that no name so given preoccupies a generic name under Article 34 or a trivial name under Article 35 ;

(2) to invite the attention of teratologists to the grave inconvenience and risk of confusion likely to arise through the use of the Linnean system of binominal nomenclature for the naming of monsters, with a view to securing their concurrence in the abandonment of this practice.

Applications relating to individual problems of nomenclature : cases published in the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature " to have priority of consideration

11. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) suggested that the Commission should now direct their attention to the applications relating to individual problems of nomenclature, the texts of which had already been published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. The Parts of the *Bulletin* containing such applications were Parts 5, 8, 9, 10, and 11. Some considerable time had elapsed since the earlier of these applications had been published and members of the Commission had therefore had ample time to consider the issues involved.

THE COMMISSION approved the proposal submitted by the Acting President, as specified above.

Part 5 of Volume I of the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature " : consideration of applications published in

12. THE COMMISSION had before them Part 5 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* containing five applications relating to individual problems of nomenclature, in addition to fourteen applications relating to the amendment or clarification of the *Règles*, which had already been considered by the Commission at earlier meetings during their present Session.

THE COMMISSION :—

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusions 2, 8 and 9*)

took note that three of the applications relating to individual problems of nomenclature included in Part 5 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* had been considered at the meeting noted in the margin, in order to suit the convenience of certain specialists attending the Section on Nomenclature, and agreed to consider forthwith the cases included in the foregoing Part of the *Bulletin* on which decisions had not yet been taken.

Oken, 1815-1816, "Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte": status of new names published in

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 9*)

13. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that at the meeting noted in the margin the Commission had agreed that the consideration of a proposal submitted by the late Dr. C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.) for the addition to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* of the names of three genera of the Order Carnivora (Class Mammalia) published by Brisson in 1762 in the *Regnum animale* should be postponed until after a decision had been taken by the Commission on the status of generic names published in that work. As explained in the note (file Z.N.(S.)177) which he (Commissioner Hemming) had published in regard to Dr. Stiles's proposal (Hemming, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1**: 112–113), Dr. Stiles had at the same time submitted a similar proposal in regard to the names of three genera belonging to the same Order which had first been published by Oken in 1815–1816 in his *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte*. The names were of importance in human medicine, for parasites common to Man had been reported from species of each of the genera concerned. It was not possible however for the Commission to reach a decision on Dr. Stiles's proposals until they had first decided whether Oken's *Lehrbuch* was a work which complied with the requirements of proviso (*b*) to Article 25 (requirement that an author must in any given work have applied the principles of binominal (formerly "binary") nomenclature). An application for a ruling on the question of the availability of names first published in Oken's *Lehrbuch* had been submitted to the Commission (file Z.N.(S.)153) by the late Dr. Wilfred H. Osgood, of Chicago, but had not yet been published in the *Bulletin*. This work contained new names in a wide range of groups in the Animal Kingdom and the new names in it had been accepted by workers in some groups and rejected by others. Doubt as to the status of names published in such a work was most undesirable and should be brought to an end as quickly as possible by an authoritative decision by the Commission. Dr. Osgood, who had been one of the foremost of American zoologists in his forthright criticism of the slowness of the work of the Commission and, as it seemed to him, of the lack of vision and courage displayed by the Commission in the past, had expressed the view that the manner and spirit in which the Commission tackled the difficult problem presented by Oken's *Lehrbuch* would be looked upon by many zoologists as the touchstone of the capacity of the Commission to deal with difficult problems. From the point of view of reassuring progressive American zoologists regarding the capacity of the Commission to discharge impartially and effectively the duties entrusted to it, it was thus of importance, quite apart from other considerations, that an early decision should be taken by the Commission in this matter. The issues involved were however complicated and the consideration of this subject was rendered difficult by the fact that few zoological libraries contained a copy of Oken's *Lehrbuch.*

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to take into consideration as soon as possible after the close of the present Session the application submitted by the late Dr. Wilfred H. Osgood (U.S.A.) for a ruling on the availability under Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 of names first published by Oken, 1816, *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte* (file Z.N.(S.)153) ;

(2) to the Secretary to confer with specialists in the groups concerned on the question of the practice (whether acceptance or rejection) adopted in their respective groups in regard to the *Lehrbuch* names and to submit a Report thereon ;

(3) pending a decision on the question in (1) above, to defer a decision on the application submitted by the late Dr. C. W. Stiles for the addition to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* of the names of three genera of the Order Carnivora (Class Mammalia) first published by Oken in the work referred to in (1) above (file Z.N.(S.)177).

Geoffroy (E.L.), 1762, " Hist. Ins. Env." Paris : status of new names published in

14. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a note (file Z.N.(S.)168) on the question of the availability under the *Règles* of generic names as first published by Geoffroy (E. L.) in 1762 in the work entitled *Histoire abrégée des Insectes qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris* submitted by the Secretary to the Commission (Hemming, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1:117).

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusions 8 and 9*)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) explained that the present belonged to the class of case, to which reference had been made in the discussion of the question of the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), where, owing to the difficulty of the problem raised, a decision by the Commission had been inordinately delayed, for it was as far back as 1915 that this issue had been raised by Dr. J. M. Swaine (Department of Agriculture, Forest Investigations Branch, Ottawa, Canada) in connection with the name *Scolytus*. In addition, the same question had a year later (1916) been raised by Dr. A. D. Hopkins (Bureau of Entomology, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.). No action was taken on those applications, and in its present form the question now before the Commission arose out of an application submitted by Professor H. B. Hungerford (U.S.A.) for a ruling in regard to the name *Corixa* Geoffroy, 1762 (file Z.N. (S.)147), which would be laid before the Commission as the next following item. Continuing, the Acting President said that the recommendation in regard to the interpretation of the expression " nomenclature binaire " and the substitution therefor of the expression " nomenclature binominale " agreed upon by the Commission at the meeting noted in the margin and the subsequent approval of that recommendation by the Section on Nomenclature carried the present case a considerable step further forward. No one disputed that in the work in question Geoffroy had been a " binary " but not a binominal author. Accordingly, under the decision referred to above, new names published by that author in the *Histoire abrégée* did not satisfy the requirements of Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 and in consequence were not available under the *Règles*. In reaching the foregoing decision in regard to Article 25, the Commission and the Section had agreed, however, that sympathetic consideration should be given to the question of validating the generic names in works rendered unavailable thereunder or to parts of such works, where it could be shown that it was in the interest of stability in nomenclature that names published in such works and at present in common use should be validated. It was therefore for the Commission to consider whether any, and, if so, what special action should be taken to validate generic names as first published by Geoffroy in 1762 in the work now under consideration.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 3*)

A CONSIDERABLE DISCUSSION took place on the question whether availability should be given to all the generic names published in the *Histoire abérgée* or only to some of them. Some of these names should, it was agreed, certainly be preserved, but the position was not so clear as regards others. It was felt that this was a subject which it would be better to deal with piecemeal, Order by Order, in the light of recommendations submitted by entomologists who were specialists in the Orders concerned.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, having regard to the recommendation adopted at their Fourth Meeting (as noted in the margin) that the expression "nomenclature binominale" should be substituted for the expression "nomenclature binaire" in Proviso (b) to Article 25 of the *Règles* and to the subsequent approval of that recommendation by the Section on Nomenclature (at its First Meeting), names as published by Geoffroy (E. L.) in 1762 in the work entitled *Histoire abrégée des Insectes qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris* were not available under the *Règles*, as Geoffroy had not applied the principles of binominal nomenclature in that work, as required by Proviso (b) to Article 25, as amended in the manner specified above ;

(2) that certain of the generic names published in the foregoing work, being in wide use, should certainly be validated in the interest of stability in nomenclature, but that, having regard to the large number of Orders of insects dealt with by Geoffroy in the foregoing work, it would be better to consider separately for each Order, in the light of advice from specialists in the Order concerned, the question whether some or all of the generic names published in the foregoing work should be rendered available rather than to render available *en bloc* all the generic names so published.

(3) to invite the Secretary to the Commission as soon as possible after the close of the present Session to arrange with specialists in the several Orders of insects concerned for the submission to the Commission of statements examining each of the generic names published for that Order by Geoffroy in the *Hist. abrég.* and containing proposals for the validation, under the plenary powers, of such of the names concerned, the rejection of which would lead to instability or confusion in the nomenclature of the group concerned, so that, in the light of the statements so received, the Commission may validate such of the names concerned as may appear to it to be appropriate and place the remainder on the

"Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology";

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decision specified in (1) above, reference being made at the same time to the decisions specified in (2) and (3) above.

"Corixa" Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera): validation of, and type species under the plenary powers

15. Arising out of the foregoing discussion, THE COMMISSION considered the problems relating to the generic name *Corixa* Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) which had been specifically raised by Professor H. B. Hungerford (file Z.N.(S.)137), the application regarding which had been published in Part 11 of Volume I of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (Hungerford, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 258-259). At the same time the Commission had under consideration a note on this application submitted by the Secretary to the Commission (Hemming, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 259).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the only letters which, as Secretary to the Commission, he had received in regard to this case, apart from that from Professor Hungerford, were from Dr. W. E. China (British Museum (Natural History)), who supported the validation of the name *Corixa* Geoffroy, and from Dr. G. A. Walton (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine), who regarded that name as invalid, but had expressed himself as being anxious to see a final decision given in this matter. The question of the type species of this genus would not be of practical importance unless the Commission were to decide to use their plenary powers to validate the generic name *Corixa* as published by Geoffroy in 1762. It appeared to him (Commissioner Hemming) that, if the Commission were to take that line, their best course would be to use the same powers to designate *Corixa geoffroyi* Leach, 1817, as the type species of this genus, as recommended by Professor Hungerford and Dr. China. This name was commonly treated as having been published in 1818, but, as shown by Sherborn (1926), it was in fact published in 1817.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to validate the generic name *Corixa* Geoffroy, 1762, *Hist. Ins. Env. Paris* 1 : 478 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera);

(b) to designate, as the type of the foregoing genus, the species *Corixa geoffroyi* Leach, 1817, *Trans. linn. Soc. Lond.* **12**(**1**) : 17 :

(2) to place the generic name *Corixa* Geoffroy, 1762 (with the above species as its type species), on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*;

(3) to defer taking a decision on the question whether the trivial name of the type species of the genus *Corixa* Geoffroy should be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* until after further consideration had been given to the question whether that name (*geoffroyi* Leach, 1817) was the oldest available trivial name for the species in question and to invite the Secretary to submit a Report on this subject as soon as possible after the close of the present Session;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

"Naucoris" Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera): question of validation of, under plenary powers to be considered

16. Arising out of the discussion on the question of the validation of generic names published by Geoffroy in his *Histoire abrégée* of 1762, recorded in Conclusion 14 above, ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER ROBERT L. USINGER (U.S.A.) brought before the Commission the question of the name *Naucoris* Geoffroy, 1762. Professor Usinger first proposed that this well-known name should be validated forthwith in the same way as the name *Corixa* Geoffroy had just been validated, but after further discussion he withdrew this proposal, being of the opinion that it would be better for this matter to be further considered by specialists before a decision was taken.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he felt also that this question should be deferred. He had had some correspondence with Dr. W. E. China in regard to this name, and he would prefer to have an opportunity of considering this case again before expressing an opinion on the action to be taken. He agreed however that it would be desirable to take a decision on this name as soon as was practicable.

THE COMMISSION agreed:—

(1) that consideration should be given, as soon as practicable after the close of the present Session, to the question whether the generic name *Naucoris* should be validated as from Geoffroy, 1762, in the Order Hemiptera (Class Insecta) by the use of the Commission's plenary powers and, if so, what species should be selected as the type species of the genus so named;

(2) to invite the Secretary to the Commission to submit a Report on the above matter as soon as possible after the close of the present Session.

" Buprestidae ", a pamphlet believed to have been written by F. W. Hope and distributed in 1836 : declared not published within the meaning of Article 25

17. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) an application submitted by the late Mr. H. J. Carter (file Z.N.(S.)57) that the Commission should give a ruling that the names which appeared in the pamphlet entitled " Buprestidae " privately and anonymously issued by Hope (F.W.) were not available under the *Règles*, those names not having been published (" divulgués dans une publication ") within the meaning of Article 25 (Carter, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 117–118) ;

(b) a note supporting the foregoing application submitted by President Karl Jordan (1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 118).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, since the foregoing papers had been published, Mr. F. J. Griffin, the British bibliographer, had furnished additional material showing that this pamphlet had never been published, including a photograph of the first page of Hope's own copy, now preserved in the Hope Department of Entomology at the Oxford University Museum, on which Westwood (the first Hope Professor of Zoology) had himself written the word " unpublished ". From these indications there could be no doubt that this pamphlet had never been published within the meaning of Article 25. The evidence that publication had never taken place was so strong that it appeared to him (Commissioner Hemming) there was no need for the Commission to use their plenary powers in this case, it being sufficient to render an *Opinion* stating that this pamphlet had never been published within the meaning of the *Règles*. No objection had been lodged by any author against the course proposed, specialists concerned having, with the exception of Dr. J. Oldenberger of Prague, all rejected the new names in this pamphlet.

(*For the definition of the expression " divulgué dans une publication," see Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 15)

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the names contained in the anonymous pamphlet entitled " Buprestidae " believed (a) to have been written by F.W. Hope and (b) to have been distributed by that author in 1836 were not published (" divulgués dans une publication ") as prescribed by Article 25 and that they therefore had no standing under the *Règles* as from the date of distribution of that pamphlet ;

(2) to render an *Opinion* recording the decision specified in (1) above.

Part 8 of Volume I of the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature": consideration of application published in

18. THE COMMISSION had before them Part 8 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* containing 21 papers relating to 18 individual problems, of nomenclature.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

> to examine, in turn, each of the applications, the texts relating to which had been published in Part 8 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature.*

Koch (C.L.), 1835-1842, "Deutschlands Crustaceen, Myriapoden und Arachniden": definition of species eligible for selection as type species of genera first named in

19. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by the late Dr. Arthur P. Jacot (file Z.N.(S.)90) for a ruling in regard to the species to be accepted as the type species of certain genera in the Class Arachnida, for which diagnoses had first been published and type species designated (or selected) by Koch (C. L.) in 1842 in his *Übersicht des Arachnidensystems* but the names of which had previously been published by that author as components of the names of new species described by that author in his work *Deutschlands Crustaceen, Myriapoden und Arachniden* (Jacot, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 161). Dr. Jacot explained that between 1835 and 1842 Koch had described in the last-mentioned work a number of new species to which he had applied new generic names. In 1842 in the *Übersicht* he had given diagnoses for these genera and had figured one species of each. In an introductory note he had referred to the species so figured as "Typus dienend". This note was accepted by most specialists as constituting a designation or selection of the species so figured to be the type species of the genera in question. Dr. Jacot had gone on to say that some specialists had questioned the propriety of this view, arguing that the type species of the genera in question should be looked for not in the *Übersicht* of 1842 but in the *Hefte* of the *Deutschlands Crustaceen* in which those names had first appeared. Dr. Jacot had taken the view that to go back to the *Deutschlands Crustaceen* in this way "hardly seems consistent with the author's idea or with customary usage." He had therefore asked the Commission to give a ruling on this question.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that many years ago the Commission had dealt (in *Opinion* 30) with a somewhat similar case which had been concerned with certain generic names in the Class Aves published by Swainson in a paper on Mexican birds which had accidentally appeared before the paper (at the same time in the press) in which Swainson had given diagnoses for these genera and had designated type species for them. In that case the Commission had ruled that the generic names in question were available as from the date on which they were published as the generic components of the names of new Mexican birds and that, where one species only was cited under one of these new names, that species was automatically the type species of the genus concerned by monotypy. In the present case, therefore, it must be accepted that, when Koch had published new generic names in this manner in the *Deutschlands Crustaceen*, the generic names in question were available under the *Règles* as from the date of being so published. Thus where in that work Koch applied a new generic name to one species only on the occasion on which that name was first published, that species was automatically the type species by monotypy; similarly, where on that occasion he applied that generic name to two or more species (as in the case of the generic name *Hoplophora*) those species alone were eligible for selection at a later date as the type species of the genus concerned. In this connection, it was important to remember that, at the meetings noted in the margin, the Commission had agreed during the present Session to recommend that provisions should be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing the method to be followed in determining the date of publication of a given book or part of a book and directing also that the expression " le plus anciennement designé ", as used in Article 25, was to be interpreted rigorously. Accordingly, it must be realised in the present case that the only species which could be accepted as originally included species of a genus established by Koch in the *Deutschlands Crustaceen* was, or were, the species cited under that generic name in the *Heft* of that work in which that generic name first appeared or, if that name appeared in two or more *Hefte* published simultaneously, in those *Hefte*. Turning to the statement made by Koch in the introduction to the volume of his *Übersicht* published in 1842, the Acting President said that some specialists by whom this matter had been considered had been doubtful whether in using the phrase " Typus dienend " Koch had intended to refer to the concept of a " type species of a genus." It might well be that, as had been suggested, Koch had used this phrase to indicate that he regarded the species which he figured as a typical representative of the genus rather than as its type species in the nomenclatorial sense. It was not possible—or appropriate—in a code of law to seek to interpret what was in the mind of a given author when making a particular statement. All that could properly be done was to look at the words which he had used and to determine what on a strict interpretation was

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 18; *9th Meeting, Conclusion* 23) the meaning applicable to them. Judged by this objective test, the statement made by Koch appeared to him (the Acting President) to satisfy the requirements in Rule (g) in Article 30. Even, however, if one thus granted that, in making that statement, Koch had made type selections under the foregoing Rule, it did not follow that the selection so made was a valid one, for this would be the case only (1) if the genus in question was not monotypical, when first published in the *Deutschlands Crustaceen* and did not contain a species having as a trivial name either the word *typus* or the word *typicus* or a word which was tautonymous with the generic name, and (2) if the species selected in the *Übersicht* was one of the species originally included in the genus on the occasion when the name in question had been first published in the *Deutschlands Crustaceen.* Dr. Jacot had not given particulars regarding the generic names covered by his application and in the absence of such particulars, it was not possible to determine whether the application of the *Règles* to those names would lead to confusion or not. If, after examining the position as regards any of the names in question, any specialist were to be of the opinion that the strict application of the *Règles* in that case would lead to instability and confusion in the nomenclature of the group concerned, it would be possible for him to submit to the Commission a statement setting out the facts of the case, with a request that the Commission should use their plenary powers to designate as the type species of the genus concerned some species, the designation as such of which was in harmony with current practice and would prevent confusion from occurring.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, in accordance with the principle illustrated by the decision given by the Commission in *Opinion* 30, the generic names published for the first time by Koch (C. L.) in *Hefte* of the work *Deutschlands Crustaceen, Myriapoden und Arachniden* during the period 1835–1842, when forming new specific names for previously unnamed species are available as from the date of being so published and the type species of a such a genus is determined under Rules (b), (c) and (d) in Article 30, where, as the case may be, an originally included species (i) bears the trivial name *typus* or *typicus*, or (ii) is the sole species so included, or (iii) bears a trivial name which is tautonymous with the generic name and in other cases under Rule (g) in that Article ;

(2) that the reference in the last paragraph of the "Vorwort" to the *Erste Abteilung* of the third volume (*Drittes Heft*) of the *Übersicht des Arachnidensystems* (published in 1842) to the single species figured in that volume for each genus as "Typus dienend" is to be accepted as constituting a selection of that species to be the type species of that genus under Rule (g) in Article 30 ;

(3) that, in the case of a genus, the name of which was first published in the *Deutschlands Crustaceen*, the type selection made for that genus by Koch in the *Übersicht* in the manner specified in (2) above is a valid selection only (a) when the genus in question was not monotypical at the time when it was first named and did not contain a species having as a trivial name either the word *typus* or the word *typicus* or a word which was tautonymous with the generic name, and (b) when the species so selected was one of the species referred to the genus in the *Heft* of the *Deutschlands Crustaceen* in which the generic name was first published or, where two or more *Hefte* were published simultaneously and the generic name appeared in more than one of these *Hefte*, one of the species so referred in any of these *Hefte;*

(4) that if, on applying the foregoing decisions, specialists are of the opinion that the adoption as the type species of any given genus of the species so determined as such would lead to instability and confusion in the nomenclature of the group concerned, it was open to those specialists to submit an application to the Commission for the use of the plenary powers and the Commission, on receiving such an application supported by adequate particulars relating to the name in question and the grounds on which instability and confusion was apprehended, could then judge whether or not the plenary powers should be used to vary the type species of the genus in question ;

(5) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above, reference being made at the same time to the decision recorded in (4) above.

"Diaptomus vulgaris" Schmeil, 1897 (Class Crustacea,

20. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by Dr. Robert Gurney (United Kingdom) (file Z.N.(S.)8) on the question of the oldest

Order Copepoda) : Validation, under the plenary powers of the trivial name " vulgaris "

available trivial name for the species renamed *Diaptomus vulgaris* by Schmeil in 1897 (Class Crustacea, Order Copepoda) (Gurney, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 162). The above name had been given by Schmeil as a name for the species of Copepod to which Fischer (1853) had applied the name *Cyclopsina coerulea*. That name would have been an available name if it had been given as a new name, but unfortunately Fischer had made it clear that the trivial name *coerulea* was not a new name but was the same name as that used by O. F. Müller in 1785, when he published the then new name *Cyclops coeruleus*. Müller's species was generally regarded by modern workers as unidentifiable, although one worker claimed to have established such an identification. Accordingly it remained a matter of continual doubt whether Müller's name *coeruleus* could be correctly applied to the species to which Schmeil had later given the trivial name *vulgaris*. It was to resolve this difficulty that the present application had been submitted to the Commission.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 14)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present was a case which fell within the class of case for which, at the meeting noted in the margin, the Commission had recommended an extension of their plenary powers. There was no question here of confusion arising through the strict application of the *Règles*. The confusion involved was of a different kind, arising through the impossibility of determining how the *Règles* should be applied. He recommended that the Commission should dispose of the difficulty in the present case by suppressing the name published by Müller in 1785 as unrecognisable, and validating the name (*Diaptomus vulgaris*) published by Schmeil in 1897, that name being not only fully documented but also the name generally (though not universally) in use for this species.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to suppress the trivial name *coeruleus* Müller (O.F.), 1785 (as published in the binominal combination *Cyclops coeruleus*) for the purposes of Article 25, but not for those of Article 35 ;

(b) to validate the trivial name *vulgaris* Schmeil, 1897 (as published in the binominal combination *Diaptomus vulgaris*) for the species of the Order Copepoda (Class Crustacea) so named ;

(2) to put the trivial name *vulgaris* Schmeil, 1897 (as published in the binominal combination *Diaptomus vulgaris*) on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" and the trivial name *coeruleus* Müller (O.F.), 1785 (as published in the binominal combination *Cyclops coeruleus*) on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

The generic name "Graptolithus" Linnaeus, 1768 and the specific name "Graptolithus scalaris" Linnaeus, 1768 (Class Graptolithina, Order Graptoloidea): suppression of, under the plenary powers

21. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by Dr. O. M. B. Bulman (United Kingdom) (file Z.N.(S.)11) for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to suppress the name *Graptolithus* Linnaeus, 1768, as a generic name and the name *Graptolithus scalaris* Linnaeus, 1768, as a specific name, having regard to the fact (a) that Linnaeus himself regarded these names as applying to inorganic matter and (2) that the name *scalaris* was now regarded as probably applying to a Graptolite, but that it could not be identified with certainty and thus remained a menace to stability in graptolite nomenclature, as long as it possessed availability under the *Règles* (Bulman, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1**: 163–164).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to suppress for purposes of Article 25 but not for those of Article 34 or, as the case might be, Article 35 :—

  (a) the generic name *Graptolithus* Linnaeus, 1768 (Class Graptolithina);

  (b) the trivial name *scalaris* Linnaeus, 1768 (as published in the binominal combination *Graptolithus scalaris*);

(2) to place the name *Graptolithus* Linnaeus, 1768, on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" and the trivial name *scalaris* Linnaeus, 1768 (as originally published in the binominal combination *Graptolithus scalaris*) on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

" Monograptus (emend. of " Monograpsus ") Geinitz, 1852 (Class Graptolithina, Order Graptoloidea) : validation of, under the plenary powers

22. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by Dr. O. M. B. Bulman (United Kingdom) (file Z.N.(S.)11) for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to validate the generic name *Monograptus* (emend. of *Monograpsus*) Geinitz, 1852, with *Lomatoceras priodon* Bronn, 1834, as its type species, and for this purpose to suppress the generic names *Lomatoceras* Bronn, 1834, and *Monoprion* Barrande, 1850 (Bulman, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 164–166). The name *Monograptus* had been in continuous use for nearly 80 years, and was extensively employed in stratigraphical literature, being probably the most important and widely distributed single graptolite genus. Great confusion, unaccompanied by any corresponding advantage, would result from the rejection of the name *Monograptus* on purely nomenclatorial grounds.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—
  (a) to suppress the generic names *Lomatoceras* Bronn, 1834, and *Monoprion* Barrande, 1850, for the purposes of Article 25 but not for those of Article 34 ;
  (b) to validate the generic name *Monograptus* (emend. of *Monograpsus*) Geinitz, 1852, with *Lomatoceras priodon* Bronn, 1834, as its type species ;

(2) to place the generic name *Monograptus* Geinitz, 1852 (Class Graptolithina, Order Graptoloidea), emended and validated as above and with the above species as its type species, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " and the trivial name *priodon* Bronn, 1834 (as published in the binominal combination *Lomatoceras priodon*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the generic names *Lomatoceras* Bronn, 1834, and *Monoprion* Barrande, 1850, on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

" Retiolites " Barrande, 1850 (Class Graptolithina, Order Graptoloidea) : validation of, under the plenary powers

23. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by Dr. O. M. B. Bulman (United Kingdom) (file Z.N.(S.)11) for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to validate the generic name *Retiolites* Barrande, 1850, by suppressing the name *Gladiolites* Barrande, 1850 (Bulman, 1946, *Bull. zool.*

Nomencl., **1** : 166). It was explained that Barrande, when proposing the latter of these names, had thought that objection might be taken to it on the ground that it was too near to the generic name *Gladiolus* in plants and had accordingly at the same time published the name *Retiolites* as an alternative name for this genus. The name *Gladiolites* had not since been used for graptolites, its place having been taken by *Retiolites*. The latter was widely used in stratigraphy, the " Retiolites Shale " being a well-known, long-established and important stratigraphical unit in the Upper Silurian of Sweden, extensively quoted not only in Scandinavian literature but also in correlation with Europe and America. Further the name *Retiolites* figured in nearly every elementary textbook of palaeontology and stratigraphy.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—
  (a) to suppress the generic name *Gladiolites* Barrande, 1850, for the purposes of Article 25 but not for those of Article 34 ;
  (b) to validate the generic name *Retiolites* Barrande, 1850, with *Gladiolites geinitzianus* Barrande, 1850, as type species ;

(2) to place the generic name *Retiolites* Barrande, 1850 (Class Graptolithina, Order Graptoloidea), validated as above and with the above species as its type species, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the generic name *Gladiolites* Barrande, 1850, on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to place the trivial name *geinitzianus* Barrande, 1850 (as published in the binominal combination *Gladiolites geinitzianus*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(5) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (4) above.

" Diplodinium " Schuberg, 1888 (Class Ciliophora) : trivial name of type species of

24. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) an application submitted by the late Professor C. A. Kofoid (U.S.A.) (file Z.N.(S.)13) for a ruling regarding the trivial name of the type species of the genus *Diplodinium* Schuberg, 1888 (Class Ciliophora) (Kofoid, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 167) ;

(b) a note on the foregoing application submitted by the Secretary to the Commission (Hemming, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 168) ;

(c) an extract from a letter addressed to the Secretary to the Commission by Professor Harold Kirby giving certain additional information asked for by Secretary Hemming (Kirby, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 169–170).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) explained that, at the time when Professor Kofoid first submitted this application to the Commission (i.e. in 1930), he accepted as probably correct the conclusion reached by Eberlein (1895) that Schuberg was in error when he identified with *Entodinium dentatum* Stein, 1858, the species on which he based his genus *Diplodinium*. Later, however, in his monograph (written jointly with MacLennan) (1932), Professor Kofoid had given grounds for believing that no error of identification had been made by Schuberg and that Eberlein himself had been in error in disputing Schuberg's identification. This view was shared also by Wertheim (1935) and, as the Commission would see, by Professor Kirby. In these circumstances all difficulty in this case disappeared.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note that it was no longer considered by specialists in the group concerned that Schuberg (1888) was in error when he identified with *Entodinium dentatum* Stein, 1858, the species placed by him under this name in the genus *Diplodinium* Schuberg, 1888 (Class Ciliophora) ;

(2) agreed that, in view of (1) above, the type species of the foregoing genus was correctly cited by Schuberg under the trivial name *dentatum* (as originally published by Stein in 1858 in the binominal combination *Entodinium dentatum*) ;

(3) agreed :—

(a) to place the generic name *Diplodinium* Schuberg, 1888 (type species by monotypy : *Entodinium dentatum* Stein, 1858, as determined by Schuberg (1888), by Kofoid and MacLennan (1932) and by Wertheim (1935)), on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(b) to place the trivial name *dentatum* Stein, 1858 (as originally published in the binominal combination *Entodinium dentatum* and as identified by the authors specified in (a) above) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) agreed to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

" Aspidoproctus " Newstead, [April] 1901 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) (a generic name published for a single species but at the same time rejected by its author as not needed for that species) : addition of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology "

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 18)

25. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by the late Professor T. D. A. Cockerell (U.S.A.) (file Z.N.(S.)46) for a ruling on the question whether a manuscript generic name (*Aspidoproctus*) published by an author (Newstead) on a given date (1901) for a given species but rejected in the same paper as being unnecessary is available, if later it is considered on taxonomic grounds that the species for which it was so published (but to which it was not actually applied except in synonymy) requires a separate generic name (Cockerell, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 171).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that, at their meeting noted in the margin, the Commission had agreed to incorporate in the *Règles* the ruling given in *Opinion* 4 on the subject of the availability of manuscript names, when published in conditions which satisfy the requirements of the provisos to Article 25. From that decision it followed that the generic name *Aspidoproctus* Newstead ranked for purposes of priority from April, 1901, the date when it was first published by Newstead. The type species of the genus *Aspidoproctus* was *Walkeriana pertinax* Newstead, April, 1901, that being the sole species in connection with which the generic name *Aspidoproctus* had then been published.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, in accordance with the ruling given in *Opinion* 4 and now to be embodied in the *Règles*, the generic name *Aspidoproctus* published by Newstead in April, 1901, as a rejected manuscript name was available under Article 25 as from the date of being so published, and accordingly had priority over the name *Lophococcus* Cockerell, [August] 1901 ;

(2) that *Walkeriana pertinax* Newstead, 1901, was the type species of the genus *Aspidoproctus* Newstead, 1901, by monotypy, that being the sole species at that time cited in connection with this generic name ;

(3) to place :—

   (a) the generic name *Aspidoproctus* Newstead, [April] 1901 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), with the above species as its type species, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(b) the trivial name *pertinax* Newstead, 1901 (as published in the binominal combination *Walkeriana pertinax*) on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

Article 25 : a specific name based upon a specimen which is undescribed but which formed part of the type series of a previously described species, declared not to satisfy Proviso (a)

26. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by the late Dr. J. M. Aldrich (U.S.A.) (file Z.N.(S.)103) for a ruling on the question whether (a) a specific name based upon a single specimen of a previously named and described species, and (b) a generic name based upon such a specific name, have any availability under the *Règles*, when no characters are given for the species or genus so named, other than that the type specimen of the species was one of the specimens included in error by a previous author among the type material of another species described by that author (Aldrich, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1**: 171). Dr. Aldrich had illustrated the problem which he had submitted by citing the case of the nominal species *Phoranthella morrisoni* Townsend, 1915 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) and the generic name *Phoranthella* then published by Townsend for the first time. The above species was designated by Townsend as the type species of the genus *Phoranthella* and accordingly the generic name *Phoranthella* would be an available name, if the name of the nominal species *Phoranthella morrisoni* Townsend could be regarded as an available name. But the only statement made by its author in regard to this species was that it was based upon one specified example of the type series of another species described by a different author (*Phorantha* (*Hyalomyia*) *occidentis* Coquillet, 1897). Dr. Aldrich had observed that Coquillet's series of *occidentis* consisted of some 40 specimens from 12 localities, and that Townsend had taken out only one specimen as misidentified; no description of *Phoranthella morrisoni* had been published by Townsend or Coquillet.

It was pointed out that under the ruling in *Opinion* 1 in no case could a museum label or specimen be accepted as an "indication" and therefore that the name *Phoranthella morrisoni* could not be regarded as having been accompanied by an "indication" at the time when it was first published (1915). As at that date, therefore, the above name was a *nomen nudum*. It followed that, as at 1915, the generic name *Phoranthella* was also a *nomen nudum*, for its identity turned solely upon the status of the nominal species designated as its type species.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, as published by Townsend in 1915, the specific name *Phoranthella morrisoni* (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), was a *nomen nudum*, and consequently, as at that date, the generic name *Phoranthella* Townsend, 1915, which depended for its recognition solely upon the status of the name of its type species, was also a *nomen nudum;*

(2) that the name *Phoranthella* Townsend, 1915, should be added to the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " and that the trivial name *morrisoni* Townsend, 1915 (as published in the binominal combination *Phoranthella morrisoni*), should be added to the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology ".

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

" Diadema " Gray, 1825 (Class Echinoidea) : validation of, under the plenary powers

27. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark) (file Z.N.(S.)52) for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to preserve the generic name *Diadema* in its accustomed sense in the Class Echinoidea (Mortensen, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 172–175).

(*Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 1)

(*Later reference : Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion* 32)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reminded the Commission that the present application had originally been submitted to them by Dr. Mortensen as long ago as 1932, after an extensive sounding of opinion among interested specialists had shown a strong desire, on the part of the great majority of those concerned, to secure the continued use in its accustomed sense of the generic name *Diadema*, the disappearance of which in synonymy would give rise to serious confusion. Preliminary consideration had been given to this matter by the Commission during their Lisbon Session in 1935, when it had been pointed out that the name *Diadema* had been published as a generic name on two occasions (by Schumacher in 1817 and by Ranzani in the same year) prior to its use in the Phylum Echinodermata by Gray in 1825. It had in consequence been agreed, at the meeting noted in the margin, that the consideration of this application should be deferred and that Dr. Mortensen should be invited to confer with himself (Commissioner Hemming) with a view to the submission to the Commission of the data required to enable a decision to be reached. The paper referred to above, which had been published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, was the outcome of those discussions. In that paper it was suggested that the Commission should use their plenary powers to validate the name *Diadema* (with *Echinometra setosa* Leske, 1778, as type species) as from Humphreys (1797, *Mus. calonn.*), notwithstanding the fact that in *Opinion* 51 the Commission had ruled against the availability of names published in that work. It had since been ascertained from Professor Hj. Broch (Oslo) that not only was the generic name *Diadema* Schumacher not in use for a Cirripede but that it would, in his opinion, lead to confusion if such a change were to be necessary, which fortunately was not the case. Continuing, the Acting President said that he had had an opportunity of a further discussion of this case with Dr. Mortensen during a visit which he had paid to Copenhagen during the previous year (1947). As a result, Dr. Mortensen and he had agreed to amend the proposal submitted to the Commission by substituting for it a proposal that the name *Diadema* Schumacher, 1817, and the name *Diadema* Ranzani (if that name was in fact distinct from that published by Schumacher) should be suppressed and that the name *Diadema* should be validated in the Class Echinoidea as from Gray, 1825, the author and date to which that name was commonly attributed, the type species of this genus to be, as previously proposed, *Echinometra setosa* Leske, 1778.

Since the Lisbon Session the application for the use of the plenary powers in this case had been advertised but that advertisement had not disclosed any information not known as the result of the sounding of opinion among interested specialists carried out by Dr. Mortensen, prior to the submission by him of his original proposal in 1932. Dr. Hubert Lyman Clark (Harvard University) had renewed his former objections, while Dr. Austin H. Clark (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) had reaffirmed his support for the action proposed.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) to use their plenary powers :—
    - (a) to suppress the names *Diadema* Schumacher, 1817, and *Diadema* Ranzani, 1817 (Class Crustacea, Sub-Class Cirripedia) ;
    - (b) to validate the name *Diadema* Gray, 1825 (Class Echinoidea) with *Echinometra setosa* Leske, 1778, as type species ;
- (2) to place the generic name *Diadema* Gray, 1825, validated as above and with the above species as its type species on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;
- (3) to place the generic names *Diadema* Schumacher, 1817, and *Diadema* Ranzani, 1817, on the " Official

Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" ;

(4) to place the trivial name *setosa* Leske, 1778 (as originally published in the binominal combination *Echinometra setosa*), on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(5) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (4) above.

Orders and Higher Taxonomic Units : problem of obtaining uniformity in nomenclature of

28. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a request received from the late Mr. Edwin Ashby (file Z.N. (S.)20) for a ruling on the question of the relative merits of the names Polyplacophora and Loricata as the name for the Class known as " Chitons " in the Phylum Mollusca (Ashby, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 176).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) suggested as the question here at issue was the regulation of names of taxonomic units above the family level, it would be convenient if, while considering the problem submitted by the late Mr. Ashby, the Commission were to consider also the application for a ruling on the relative merits of the names Bryozoa and Polyzoa for the Class universally known by one or other of these names submitted by Sir Sidney Harmer (United Kingdom) (file Z.N.(S.)72), through the late Dr. W. L. Sclater, on behalf of the " Zoological Record Committee " of the Zoological Society of London (Harmer, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 230–231).

IN THE COURSE OF A GENERAL DISCUSSION the view was expressed that it was anomalous that zoologists should have taken so much pains, first by the adoption of the *Règles*, and second, by the grant of special powers to the International Commission, to promote uniformity in nomenclature up to the family level but should have done nothing to secure a similar object for the great categories represented by Orders, Classes and Phyla. The reason was, no doubt, that, at the time when the *Règles* were established, the task of grappling with the problems involved in nomenclature up to the family level were such as to leave zoologists with insufficient energy to tackle the problem of the nomenclature of the higher categories. There were naturally zoologists who were such narrow specialists that they saw no harm in the same word being used to denote (for example) Orders in two different Classes in the Animal Kingdom, but to zoologists of wider outlook, particularly to University and other teachers of zoology, the present situation was highly unsatisfactory, being both illogical and calculated to cause confusion. The question had been raised some years before the war at a meeting of the American Association for the

Advancement of Science but no practical suggestions had then been formulated. Undoubtedly, zoologists in general were becoming increasingly tired of the state of disorder which still reigned in this field of zoological nomenclature, and it was natural therefore that such zoologists or groups of zoologists should turn to the Commission for guidance, as first the late Mr. Ashby had done, and later the Zoological Record Committee of the Zoological Society of London. On the other hand the problems involved were essentially difficult and great care would be necessary in the choice of an approach to the subject. It was generally felt that, however disappointing a further delay might be to those who were interested to secure some progress in this field or even to obtain some guidance in particular cases, the best course would be to avoid expressing any piecemeal opinion in this matter. The best hope lay in carrying out first a thorough examination of the whole field in conjunction with interested specialists.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to recommend that Commissioner Francis Hemming (Secretary to the Commission) should be invited to make a thorough study, in conjunction with interested specialists, of the problems involved in securing uniformity in the nomenclature of categories down to, and including, the Categories Order (*Ordo*) and Sub-Order (*Sub-Ordo*), and to submit a comprehensive Report thereon, with recommendations, to the Commission at their meeting to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress, with a view to the submission by the Commission of recommendations for the insertion in the *Règles* of comprehensive provisions dealing with this subject ;

(2) in view of (1) above, to defer decisions on the applications received for advice on the relative merits of :—

   (a) the Class Names Polyplacophora and Loricata in the Phylum Mollusca ;

   (b) the Class Names Bryozoa and Polyzoa.

***Fasciola ovata* Rudolphi, 1803 (Class Trematoda, Order Digenea), a composite nominal species : action by Braun in determining taxonomic identity of, correct under Article 31**

29. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by Dr. G. Witenberg (Hebrew University, Jerusalem) (file Z.N.(S.)126) asking for a ruling on the question whether Braun, on discovering that the original vial containing specimens determined by Rudolphi as *Fasciola ovata* Rudolphi, 1803 (Class Trematoda, Order Digenea) contained two species, acted in accordance with the *Règles* when he selected one of those species to be the species to which the foregoing name should adhere (Witenberg, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 176).

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 11).

In the discussion on this application it was pointed out that, whatever doubt might have existed at the time when Dr. Witenberg submitted the present application to the Commission, there was now no doubt at all regarding the validity of the action taken by Braun in this case, for that action was in strict conformity with the procedure to be laid down in Article 31, when amended in accordance with the recommendations agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin held during the present Session.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that Braun (1901) had acted in strict conformity with Article 31 of the *Règles* when, on ascertaining, by reference to Rudolphi's original material of *Fasciola ovata* Rudolphi, 1803 (Class Trematoda, Order Digenea), that that species was a composite species containing two taxonomically distinct species, he had selected one of those species to be the species to which the name *Fasciola ovata* Rudolphi, 1803, should adhere ;

(2) that the trivial name *ovata* Rudolphi, 1803 (as published in the binominal combination *Fasciola ovata*), as determined by Braun (1901), should be placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

***Petalifera* Gray, 1847, and *Aplysiella* Fischer, 1872 (Class Gastropoda, Order Aplysiomorpha) : relative status of**

30. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by Dr. H. Engel (Zoologisch Museum, Amsterdam) (file Z.N.(S.)150) regarding the relative status of the names *Petalifera* Gray, 1847, and *Aplysiella* Fischer, 1872 (Class Gastropoda, Order Aplysiomorpha) (Engel, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 177).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that this was one of the oldest of the outstanding cases which had been transferred to him by his predecessor, it having been submitted to the Commission by Dr. Engel as far back as 1933. He was therefore most anxious that a decision on it should, if possible, be reached at the present Session. At the time when this application was submitted, the name *Aplysiella* Fischer, 1872, was in general use for *Aplysia petalifera* Rang, 1828 its type species, though in 1896 Pilsbry had sunk this generic name as a synonym of *Petalifera* Gray, 1847 (type species, by absolute tautonymy: *Aplysia petalifera* Rang, 1828). The latter name had, however, been published by Gray in a most irregular manner as a synonym of a new genus (*Dolabrifera*) then established by himself for the first time. At their meeting noted in the margin the Commission had agreed to defer for further study the question of the species to be regarded as eligible for selection as the type species of a genus established in a generic synonymy. It might be argued however that in spite of the defective manner in which the name *Petalifera* Gray had been first published, there could be no doubt as to its type species, that having been designated by absolute tautonymy under Rule (d) in Article 30; and that the generic name *Petalifera* Gray, 1847, satisfied all the requirements of Article 25, for even before the liberalisation of the definition of the expression "indication" agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, this name had been published with an "indication," as then defined in *Opinion* 1, for it had been published with an indicated type species. The only question which remained to be considered was whether greater confusion than uniformity was likely to result through the digging-up of this long-forgotten name. On the evidence submitted, it had appeared that this was probable, but through the slowness of the action of the Commission it was possible that the position might have changed and that now the best course would be to let the *Règles* take their course.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 37).

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 13).

THE VIEW WAS EXPRESSED that, for reasons explained by the Acting President, it was desirable that a decision should be reached on this case as soon as possible. On the other hand, it was important that the inquiry to which the Acting President had referred should not be in any way prejudged. It was further felt that before a decision was taken, it was desirable that information should be obtained from interested specialists on the question whether, if it were found that the name *Petalifera* Gray 1847, were an available name and therefore that that name should be substituted for the name *Aplysiella* Fischer, 1872, that substitution would be likely to cause greater confusion than uniformity. In the light of the information so obtained, it would be possible both to meet the wishes of specialists and to avoid prejudging the question of principle involved, by the use *ad hoc* of the plenary powers, in so far as might be necessary. If the consensus of opinion were to show that no serious confusion was to be apprehended, the Commission could then settle the present case by placing the name *Petalifera* Gray, 1847, on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" and the name *Aplysiella* Fischer, 1872, on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology". If, on the other hand, the proposed consultation were to show that the substitution of names indicated above would be likely to cause confusion, it would be open to the Commission to preserve the generic name *Aplysiella* Fischer as against the older name *Petalifera* Gray.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to invite the Secretary to the Commission to ascertain from interested specialists whether, if *Petalifera* Gray, 1847, were found to be an available name, the substitution of that name for *Aplysiella* Fischer, 1872, which would then be necessary, would be likely to give rise to greater confusion than uniformity ;

(2) to take a final decision and render an *Opinion* on the present application as quickly as possible after the information asked for in (1) above was available.

***Acme* Hartmann, 1821, *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, and *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833 (Class Gastropoda) ; relationship of these names to one another under Article 34.**

31. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)27) submitted by Mrs. Avery R. Test (formerly Avery R. Grant) (University of California, Berkeley, U.S.A.) for a ruling on the question whether the name *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833 (Class Gastropoda, Order Archaeogastropoda) was to be treated as a homonym of *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821 (there treated as an emendation by Hartmann of the name *Acme* Hartmann published in the same year) (Class Gastropoda, Order Mesogastropoda) (Test, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 178–180).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, since Mrs. Test's application had been published in the *Bulletin*, he had received a detailed communication on this case from Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (San Diego, California, U.S.A.). This communication threw a new light on this case and presented data which differed in important respects from the information previously available to the Commission. The most important point of difference made by Mr. Baily was that *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, was not (as many authors, including Mrs. Test in her application to the Commission, had considered) an emendation by Hartmann of his own name *Acme* Hartmann published in the same year, but had in fact been given by Hartmann to a different genus. Further, evidence was advanced by Mr. Baily to show that the *Neue Alpina* in which the name *Acmea* Hartmann first appeared was actually published earlier in 1821 than the portion (Heft 5) of volume 6 of Sturm's *Deutschland's Fauna* in which the name *Acmė* Hartmann first appeared. There were therefore three (and not merely two) generic names to consider :—(1) *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833 (Class Gastropoda, Order Archaeogastropoda), a well-established name in universal use which all interested specialists were agreed should, if possible, be preserved; (2) *Acme* Hartmann, 1821, originally described on page 37 of Heft 5 of Vol. 6 of Sturm's *Deutschland's Fauna* without included species, and in 1822 used by Hartmann (*ibid.* 6 (Heft 6) : 61), for *Bulimus lineatus* Draparnaud, 1801, in place of *Acicula* Hartmann, 1821, an invalid homonym (*Acme* Hartmann, 1821, was stated by Mr. Baily to be in general use, though he pointed out that some authors (but not he himself) had rejected it on the ground of its similarity to *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833.); (3) *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, had, it appeared, never been in popular use, the genus concerned having been consistently known by the name *Truncatella* Risso, 1826, until Iredale in 1915 had drawn attention to the earlier name.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusions* 41)

Continuing, the Acting President recalled that, at the meeting noted in the margin, it had been decided to recommend a clarification of Article 34, which would put an end to all doubts as to the circumstances in which two similar but not identical generic names were to be regarded as homonyms of one another. That decision affected the present case in two ways : (1) It was now clear that neither the name *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, nor the name *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833, was a homonym of *Acme* Hartmann, 1821; (2) the names *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, and *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833, were to be regarded as homonyms of one another only if it was " evident " that they were based upon the same Latin or Latinised word. On this latter question, extensive data had been advanced in the papers submitted to show that the words of which these two names were composed—which were admittedly Latinised Greek words—were entirely distinct from one another and possessed quite different meanings. In these circumstances, it was not " evident " that these two names were based upon the same word. Accordingly, *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, and *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833, were not to be regarded as homonyms of one another. This was satisfactory, in that it enabled the strong general desire of specialists that the well-known generic name *Acmaea* Eschscholtz should be preserved to be realised. On the other hand, it could not be disputed that the concurrent existence within a single Class (the Class Gastropoda) of two generic names differing from one another by so little as did the names *Acmea* and *Acmaea* was calculated to give rise to confusion. For this reason, there seemed to the Acting President to be good reason to use the plenary powers to suppress the name *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, the separate existence of which as a generic name had had only recently been brought to light by the bibliographical investigations conducted by Mr. Baily. Moreover, this course had the further important advantage that it would validate the well-known and universally-accepted name *Truncatella* Risso, 1826, which otherwise would fall to the resurrected name *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821.

IN DISCUSSION, it was generally agreed that a solution of the long-standing difficulties associated with these names ought to be found with as little further delay as possible, and the hope was expressed that the suggestion which had been put forward would provide the ground for such a settlement. The case in favour of using the plenary powers to suppress the name *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, was a strong one, for not only would that action eliminate all possibility of confusion arising from the use of the later name *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833, but it would also provide a means for preserving the long-established name *Truncatella* Risso, 1826, which otherwise would fall a victim to *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, the separate existence of which, as a generic name, had only just been established. It was desirable that the suggested solution should be put to specialists as quickly as possible with a view to early action by the Commission and the issue of an *Opinion* as soon as the desires of the specialists concerned had been ascertained.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the generic name *Acme* Hartmann, 1821 (type species, by monotypy : *Bulimus lineatus* Draparnaud, 1801), was an available name in the sense that it was not a homonym of any previously published generic name, and further that no evidence had been adduced which would justify the emendation, under Article 19, of this name from *Acme* to *Acmea* ;

(2) that, under the clarification of Article 34 agreed upon during the present Session, the undermentioned generic names were not to be regarded as homonyms of one another :—

(a) *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821 (type species, by selection by Iredale, 1915) : *Acmea truncata* Hartmann, 1821 (= *Cyclostoma truncatulum* Draparnaud, 1801) (Class Gastropoda, Order Mesogastropoda) ;

(b) *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833 (type species, by selection by Dall, 1871 : *Acmaea mitra* Eschscholtz, 1833) (Class Gastropoda, Order Archaeogastropoda) ;

(3) that, in view of likelihood of continued confusion if two such similar names as *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, and *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833, were both used in a single Class (Class Gastropoda) and having regard also to the strong objection to which the substitution of the unknown name *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, for the well-known and long-established

name *Truncatella* Risso, 1826, would be open, specialists should be asked to express their opinion on the proposal that the plenary powers should be used to suppress the name *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, thereby eliminating all possibility of confusion arising from the use of the name *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833, and at the same time validating the name *Truncatella* Risso, 1826, while the third genus concerned (of which *Bulimus lineatus* Draparnaud, 1801, is the type species) would be known by its valid name *Acme* Hartmann, 1821 ;

(4) to invite the Secretary to the Commission to re-submit this case as soon as the inquiry instituted under (3) above had been completed ;

(5) to reach a decision on this case, and to render an *Opinion* thereon, as quickly as possible after the receipt of the Report asked for in (4) above, the case in the meantime to be regarded as *sub judice* and the name *Truncatella* Risso, 1826, not to be replaced by the name *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821.

" Ammonites cordatus " Sowerby, 1813 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea) : designation of a lectotype under the plenary powers.

32. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) an application submitted by Dr. W. J. Arkell (then of the University Museum, Oxford) (file Z.N.(S)58) for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers for the purpose of setting aside the selection by Miss M. Healey (1905) of fig. 2 on pl. 17 of vol. 1. of Sowerby's *Min. Conch. Great Britain* as the lectotype of *Ammonites cordatus* Sowerby, 1813, and of designating in its place fig. 4 on the same plate (Arkell, 1946, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 181–184, 1 pl.) ;

(*b*) a note by the Secretary to the Commission on the scope of the proposal submitted by Dr.Arkell (Hemming, 1946, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 185).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) pointed out that a large part of Dr. Arkell's case rested upon the fact that *Ammonites cordatus* Sowerby, as identified with Sowerby's figure 4, was an important index fossil, giving its name to the " Cordatus Zone " of the Jurassic. It fell therefore in the class of case which the Commission had agreed at the meeting noted in the margin called for specially sympathetic consideration. It was clearly most important that the names of zone fossils of importance in stratigraphy should not lightly be changed for reasons of a purely technical nomenclatorial character. In the present case Dr. Arkell argued that great confusion would arise if Miss Healey's selection of Sowerby's fig. 2 to be the lectotype were to be upheld ; it would involve the disappearance of the term " Cordatus Zone " which everybody knew and which was moreover adopted by, amongst many others, Roman (1938) in his monumental *Ammonites jurassiques et crétacés*, and the substitution for that term of the expression " Subcordatum Zone ", for the term " Cardia Zone " adopted by Buckman and Spath in place

(*Previous reference: Paris Session. 8th Meeting, Conclusion 4*) of "Cordatus Zone" was in any event incorrect. Continuing, the Acting President said that he had received two further communications in regard to this case, the first from Dr. L. F. Spath (British Museum (Natural History), London) objecting to the grant of the present application, the second, from Dr. J. Brookes Knight, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America, reporting that by a vote of six (Romer, Newell, Cooper, Moore, Keen, and Knight) to five (Simpson, Wells, Palmer, Frizzell, and Reeside), with one abstention (Stenzel) the Committee had voted in favour of the adoption of Dr. Arkell's proposal. In forwarding this communication, Dr. Knight had stated that, in view of the closeness of the voting, the Joint Committee did not feel justified in taking a stand, but it passed on to the Commission the resolution and the record of the vote for what it was worth as a contribution to the Commission's study of the case. The Acting President added that, prior to the present Session, it would have been difficult to deal with Dr. Arkell's application, for up till then the Article (Article 31) which dealt with the determination of the type specimen of a composite nominal species was obscure and inadequate. Moreover, up till then, the expression "lectotype" itself did not figure in the *Règles*. Both these defects had however been remedied by decisions taken during the present Session.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 11 ; *6th Meeting, Conclusion* 75)

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

 (a) to set aside all selections of a lectotype for *Ammonites cordatus* Sowerby 1813 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea) made prior to the present decision ;

 (b) to designate figure 4 on plate 17 of volume 1 of Sowerby's *Mineral Conchology of Great Britain,* published in 1813, to be the lectotype of *Ammonites cordatus* Sowerby, 1813 ;

(2) to place the trivial name *cordatus* Sowerby, 1813 (as published in the binominal combination *Ammonites cordatus*), determined as specified in (1) (b) above, on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

"Actinote" Hübner, [1819] (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera): designation of type

33. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)63) submitted jointly by Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) and Mr.

species of, under the plenary powers.

N. D. Riley (British Museum (National History) London), asking for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers for the purpose of designating *Papilio thalia* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the genus *Actinote* Hübner, (1819) (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) (Hemming and Riley, 1946, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 186–187).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING), said that the present application, which had been submitted by Mr. Riley and himself as specialists in the Order Lepidoptera, was concerned to prevent the confusion which would arise it if were necessary to accept as the type species of the genus *Actinote* Hübner not the species intended by the original author of the genus (a species of the subfamily ACRAEINAE of the family NYMPHALIDAE) but the species (of the subfamily NYMPHALINAE) to which the name of the type species properly applied. The present was therefore a case of a genus having as its type species an erroneously determined species, and, as such, was submitted to the Commission in accordance with the invitation given by the Commission when taking the decision later embodied in their *Opinion* 168, a decision which at the meeting noted in the margin held during the present Session was now to be incorporated in the *Règles*. No objection had been received from any source in regard to the action proposed in this case.

(*Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion* 23)

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 38)

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) said that this case was of special importance, for the strict application of the *Règles* thereto would not only cause great confusion in the systematics of the family concerned, but would also have the effect of sinking as a synonym the generic name *Pseudacraea* Westwood [1850], a name widely known to, and used by, workers in the field of mimicry. He commended this proposal to the favourable consideration of the Commission.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

- (a) to set aside all selections of the type species of the genus *Actinote* Hübner [1819] (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) made prior to the present decision ;
- (b) to designate *Papilio thalia* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the foregoing genus ;

(2) to place the generic name *Actinote* Hübner, [1819], with the type species designated in (1) (b) above, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the trivial name *thalia* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio thalia*) on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

"Hemerobius" Linnaeus, 1758, and "Chrysopa" Leach 1815 (Class Insecta, Order Neuroptera): designation of type species of, under the plenary powers

34. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)42) submitted jointly by Mr. John Cowley (Bridgwater, Somerset, England), Dr. F. J. Killington (Parkstone, Dorset, England), Mr. D. E. Kimmins (British Museum (Natural History), London) and Miss C. E. Longfield (British Museum (Natural History), London), asking that the Commission should use their plenary powers to designate *Hemerobius humulinus* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the genus *Hemerobius* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Hemerobius perla* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the genus *Chrysopa* Leach, 1815 (Class Insecta, Order Neuroptera) (Cowley, Killington, Kimmins & Longfield, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1**: 188–191). The specialists by whom this application was submitted were members of the Sub-Committee on Neuropteroid Groups of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature of the Royal Entomological Society of London, and it was by the last-named body that the application had been laid before the Commission.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that in its present form the application now before the Commission had been submitted in June 1937. The same question had however been previously raised in 1927 by Dr. Roger C. Smith (Kansas State Agricultural College, Manhattan, Kansas, U.S.A.) and in 1931 by Dr. F. C. Hottes (Urbana, Ill., U.S.A.), but for reasons which it had been impossible to trace neither of those applications had been brought before the Commission for decision. The actual problem raised in this application was very simple: The species *Hemerobius humulinus* Linnaeus, 1758, was universally accepted as the type species of the genus *Hemerobius* Linnaeus, 1758, and had been so accepted ever since that name had been published, but under the *Règles* this species was in fact the type species of *Chrysopa* Leach, 1815, whereas the type species of *Hemerobius* Linnaeus was *Hemerobius perla* Linnaeus. The strict application of the *Règles* in this case would thus involve the exchange of type species of these two genera and would lead to the greatest confusion not only because of the importance of the genera themselves, but also because each of these genera was the type genus of a family in the

Order Neuroptera. This was therefore a case pre-eminently suitable for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers, for the Congress, when granting those powers in 1913, had expressly referred to the need for preventing by this means the confusion which would arise from the transfer of names from one taxonomic unit to another. The only comments which had been received in regard to this case were :—(1) from Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark) and (2) from Dr. C. F. W. Muesebeck (United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.), both of whom supported the application. Dr. Muesebeck had written : " I think this is an excellent illustration of how the principle of establishing an official list may be used. Certainly it would avoid confusion in this case and action by the Commission in this respect would be highly desirable." He (the Acting President) fully shared Dr. Muesebeck's view and he accordingly strongly recommended that the application submitted should be approved.

IN THE FOLLOWING DISCUSSION the view was expressed that it would be a disaster if the Law of Priority were to be allowed to create the confusion which would be inevitable unless the Commission used their plenary powers in the manner proposed.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—
  (a) to set aside all selections of the type species of the under-mentioned genera made prior to the present decision :—
    (i) *Hemerobius* Linnaeus, 1758 ;
    (ii) *Chrysopa* Leach, 1815 ;
  (b) to designate *Hemerobius humulinus* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the genus *Hemerobius* Linnaeus, 1758 ;
  (c) to designate *Hemerobius perla* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the genus *Chrysopa* Leach, 1815 ;

(2) to place the under-mentioned names on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " :—
  (a) *Hemerobius* Linnaeus, 1758 (with the type species designated in (1)(b) above) ;
  (b) *Chrysopa* Leach, 1815 (with the type species designated in (1)(c) above) ;

(3) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " :—

(a) *humulinus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Hemerobius humulinus*);

(b) *perla* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Hemerobius perla*);

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

Articles 34 and 35 : position of a " nomen dubium " in relation to generic and specific homonymy defined.

35. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S).131) submitted by the late Dr. Arthur P. Jacot, asking for a ruling on the question whether it was necessary to treat the name *Acarus alatus* Hermann, 1804 (Class Arachnida, Order Acarina) as an invalid homonym of *Acarus alatus* Schrank, 1803, having regard to the fact that the latter name was a *nomen dubium*, the species so named by Schrank being unrecognisable (Jacot, 1946, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 191).

IN THE DISCUSSION which took place on this application it was observed that the point raised by Dr. Jacot was misconceived, for the *Règles* were concerned exclusively with objective nomenclatorial facts, not with taxonomic conceptions regarding the units to which names were given. The gravest confusion would immediately arise if the *Règles* were to provide that homonyms could be ignored when the older of any pair of homonyms was the name of a species which was unrecognisable. For such a provision would introduce a very dangerous subjective element into the problem of specific homonymy and inevitably lead to different names being used for the same species by different workers, in view of the fact that—as was well known to all systematists—a species that was unrecognisable to one worker was often recognised by another. The answer to the question raised by the late Dr. Jacot must therefore be that a specific name cannot be ignored for the purposes of Article 35 on the ground that it is a *nomen dubium*. In view of the fact that this question had been specifically raised, it would be useful if words were inserted in Article 35 to make the position clear. A corresponding provision should be inserted in Article 34, for a similar problem would arise when a generic name was indeterminate through its type species being unrecognisable.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) agreed that a very dangerous subjective element would be introduced into the problem of specific homonymy if it were permissible to ignore for the purposes of Article 35 a specific name or a specific trivial name on the ground that that name was a

nomen dubium, the species to which it had been applied by its original author being unrecognisable ;

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 1).

(2) recalled that the scheme for the reform of the provisions in the *Règles* relating to specific homonymy agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin made no exception in favour of *nomina dubia* ;

(3) agreed that, in order to prevent any misunderstanding in this matter, it would be desirable that the position in regard to *nomina dubia* in relation to generic and specific homonymy should be dealt with in express terms in Articles 34 and 35 ;

(4) agreed to recommend :—

(a) that words should be inserted in the Article which it had been agreed should replace the existing Article 35 to make it clear (i) that a specific name, which was the older published of a pair of primary homonyms or, as the case might be, of secondary homonyms was not to be ignored for the purposes of this Article on the ground that, judged from the taxonomic standpoint, that name was a *nomen dubium*, the species to which it was applied by its original author being unrecognisable, and therefore (ii) that in such a case the later published of the pair of homonyms concerned is to be rejected in like manner as though the earlier published name was not a *nomen dubium* ;

(b) that the following example should be inserted in the *Règles* to illustrate the proposition laid down in (a) above :—

> In the case of the pair of homonyms constituted by the names *Acarus alatus* Schrank, 1803, and *Acarus alatus* Hermann, 1804, the earlier published of these names is not to be ignored for the purposes of this Article on the ground that it is a *nomen dubium* and accordingly the later published of these names is to be rejected as a homonym.

(c) that words should be inserted in Article 34 to make it clear (i) that a generic name which is the older published of a pair of homonyms is not to be ignored for the purposes of that Article on the ground that, judged from the taxonomic standpoint, the genus so named is indeterminate, its type species being unrecognisable and having therefore a name which is a *nomen dubium*, and accordingly (ii) that in such a case the later published of the generic names in question is to be rejected as invalid, in like manner as though the type species of the genus bearing the earlier published identical generic name was not a *nomen dubium*.

" Palaeaneilo " Hall, 1869 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Protobranchia) : emendation to " Palaeoneilo " under Article 19

36. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)62) submitted by Dr. L. R. Cox (British Museum (Natural History), London) asking the Commission to give a ruling that the spelling of the generic name *Palaeaneilo* Hall, (J.), 1869 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Protobranchia) should be amended to *Palaeoneilo* (Cox, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 192). Dr. Cox explained in his application that this generic name was intended to suggest that the genus so named was ancestral to the living genus *Neilo* Adams, 1854 . The first part of this compound noun should therefore have been spelt " *Palaeo-*". In fact however it was consistently spelt " *Palaea-*" in the paper in which the name was first published. The genus was of importance in the Palaeozoic Lamellibranchia and, in the submission of the applicant, it would be both objectionable on etymological grounds and calculated to cause confusion if the incorrect spelling used by Hall, when publishing this name, were allowed to stand. Dr. Cox accordingly asked that the required emendation should be authorised by the Commission under their plenary powers. Such action would give validity to the universal practice of specialists in the group concerned.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that two comments had been received in regard to this application : (1) from Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark) supporting the action proposed ; (2) from Dr. J. Brookes Knight, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America, stating that the Committee had adopted (by a majority of 9 to 2) a resolution opposing the use of the plenary powers in the present case, considering that this was a matter which should be determined by the ordinary provisions of the *Règles*. In his application Dr. Cox had taken the view that the result which he sought could not be attained through Article 19 and it was for this reason that he had asked the Commission to use their plenary powers. This was a matter however which must not be prejudged and which the Commission would need to consider before they examined the need for, or the desirability of, using the plenary powers in this case.

IN THE DISCUSSION which followed, the view was expressed that, having regard to the fact that the compound word selected for this generic name was intended to denote that this genus was regarded by its author as being ancestral to the living genus *Neilo* Adams, it was quite " évident " that the first portion of the compound word was based upon the Greek adjective παλαιός, in exactly the same way as in the 500 odd other generic names similarly formed. In these circumstances it was " évident " also that the spelling " Palaeaneilo " was incorrect and a " faute d'orthographe ". In these circumstances the spelling should be corrected by the emendation of the name to " Palaeoneilo " under the provisions of Article 19. There was therefore no need to consider the portion of the application which related to the possible use of the plenary powers in this case.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that it was " évident " that the spelling of the generic name *Palaeaneilo* Hall, 1869 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Protobranchia) was a " faute d'orthographe " and therefore that the spelling of this name should be corrected by emending the name to *Palaeoneilo* under the provisions of Article 19 ;

(2) to place the generic name *Palaeoneilo* Hall, 1869 (type species : *Nuculites constricta* Conrad (T.A.), 1842, by selection by Hall (1885)) on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the trivial name *constricta* Conrad, 1842 (as published in the binominal combination *Nuculites constricta*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

Part 9 of Volume 1 of the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature " : applications published in, to be considered in turn.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

37. THE COMMISSION had before them Part 9 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* containing 27 papers relating to 24 individual problems of nomenclature.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note that two of the papers published in Part 9 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* had already been considered at the

meeting noted in the margin in connection with the problem presented by the names *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856, and *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858;

(2) agreed to examine, in turn, each of the remaining 23 applications, 25 papers relating to which had been published in the foregoing Part of the *Bulletin*.

Article 5 (position when the type genus of a .... family is united with another genus and the combined genus is treated as belonging to the same family as a third genus, having an older name than either of the other genera) problem to be dealt with in Report to be prepared by Secretary.

38. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)29) submitted by Dr. H. W. Manter (Department of Zoology and Anatomy, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, U.S.A.) asking for a ruling on the question of the name to be employed for the family containing the genus *Dissotrema* Goto & Matsudaira, 1918 (Class Trematoda, Order Digenea) (Manter, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 197-198). The problem for consideration arose through the action, first, of Goto (1919) in sinking the genus *Dissotrema* Goto & Matsudaira as a synonym of *Gyliauchen* Nicoll, 1915, second, of Fukui (1928) in treating *Gyliauchen* Nicoll, 1915 (with which also he synonymised *Dissotrema* Goto & Matsudaira, 1918) as belonging to the same family as the genus *Opistholebes* Nicoll, 1915, the generic name of which had page priority over the name *Gyliauchen* Nicoll. The questions at issue were: Should Goto (1919) have changed the family name from DISSOTREMATIDAE to GYLIAUCHENIDAE, and was Fukui correct in changing the family name to OPISTHOLEBETIDAE ?

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 7)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reminded the Commission that the general principle involved in the present application had been raised by himself in Point (36) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15. When considering this matter, the Commission had recognised that this was an important matter on which it was very desirable that adequate provision should be made in the *Règles*. They had taken the view, however, that, as it raised one of the most difficult questions involved in the nomenclature of families, it would prejudice the inquiry which, at the meeting noted in the margin, the Commission had invited the Secretary to undertake into the whole problem of the nomenclature of this category of name, if a decision were now to be taken on this particular aspect of the subject. The Commission had accordingly agreed to make no recommendation to the present Congress for the clarification of the *Règles* in this regard but to invite the Secretary to pay special attention to this problem in the Report on the general problem of the nomenclature of families which they had invited him to prepare. He (the

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

Acting President) considered therefore that no decision could properly be taken on the individual case submitted by Dr. Manter. He suggested however that the documents relating to that case should be added to the *dossier* of papers to be studied by the Secretary at the outset of the investigation which he had been invited to undertake.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to defer taking a decision on the question of the name of the family of the genus *Dissotrema* Goto & Matsudaira, 1918 (Class Trematoda, Order Digenea) submitted by Dr. H. W. Manter, until after the receipt of the comprehensive Report on the nomenclature of families which the Secretary to the Commission had been invited to prepare for the consideration of the Commission at their Session to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the International Congress of Zoology ;

(2) that the papers relating to the case submitted by Dr. Manter should be added to the *dossier* to be studied by the Secretary to the Commission at the outset of the investigation referred to in (1) above ;

(3) to invite the Secretary to the Commission to write to Dr. Manter informing him of the foregoing decision and explaining the grounds on which it had been taken.

Pallas (P.S.), " Zoographia rosso-asiatica " : dates of publication of the several volumes of, determined.

39. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)25) submitted by the late Mr. W. L. Sclater, as Chairman of the " Zoological Record " Committee of the Zoological Society of London, asking for a ruling on the dates to be accepted as the dates of publication of the several volumes of Pallas (P.S.), *Zoographia rosso-asiatica* (Sclater, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 198-199), together with a paper by the late Dr. C. D. Sherborn, setting out the data available in regard to the above subject (Sherborn, 1947, *ibid.* **1** : 199–200).

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 18)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, prior to the opening of the present Congress, the Commission would have had no guiding principle by which to consider the present application. In view however of the provisions which, at the meeting noted in the margin, it had been agreed should be inserted in the *Règles* for the purpose of determining the dates of publication of works containing zoological names, the problem before the Commission no longer presented any difficulty. Copies bearing the date " 1811 " were known both of volume 1 and of volume 2 of Pallas's *Zoographia*. There was no evidence to rebut the initial assumption (now to be adopted in such cases) that the date printed on the title page was correct; in these circumstances the late Dr. Sherborn had been right in adopting the date "1811" for the first two volumes of the *Zoographia*. The third volume was undated in the first issue and it was therefore necessary to determine by reference to contemporary literature the date by which at latest that volume must have been published. Dr. Sherborn had shown that this date was "1814."

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that under the provisions added to the *Règles* during the present Congress the dates to be assigned to the several volumes of Pallas (P.S.), *Zoographia rosso-asiatica*, were :—

Volume 1	1811
Volume 2	1811
Volume 3	[1814];

(For the decision under which the date assigned to Vol. 3 (but not those assigned to Vols. 1 and 2) is here placed in square brackets, see Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion 19)

(2) that, in view of (1) above, new names published in the foregoing work rank for purposes of priority as from the dates severally specified above;

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

" Clavellarius " Olivier, 1789 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) : suppression of, under the plenary powers (decision supplementary to " Opinion " 144)

(Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion 2)

40. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a joint communication (file Z.N.(S.) 120) received from Dr. H. H. Ross and Dr. B. D. Burke (then of the Illinois State Natural History Survey, Urbana, Ill., U.S.A.) drawing attention to the fact that, although at Lisbon the Commission had used their plenary powers to suppress the name *Crabro* Geoffroy, 1762, for the purpose of validating the name *Cimbex* Olivier, 1790 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera), there nevertheless still remained a generic name, *Clavellarius* Olivier, 1789, which had the same type species as, and had priority over, the name *Cimbex* Olivier, 1790, the latter being indeed no more than a *nom. nov. pro Clavellarius* Olivier, 1789, which in 1790 Olivier had considered should be discarded on the ground that it was too close to the generic name *Clavaria*, already used in botany (Ross and Burke, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 201–202). At the same time, the Commission had under consideration a note on this case by the Secretary to the Commission (Hemming, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 202–203).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the communication received from Dr. Ross and Dr. Burke disclosed a defect in the action taken by the Commission when validating the generic name *Cimbex* Olivier, 1790. As that action had been taken under the plenary powers, its validity was not in any circumstances open to question. Nevertheless, it was anomalous and unsatisfactory in such a case to leave unsuppressed a name (such as *Clavellarius* Olivier) which, as the result of action taken under the plenary powers in regard to another name (in the present case, the name *Cimbex* Olivier) could never be used, even though it was the oldest name for the taxonomic unit in question. He had accordingly proposed (in the paper cited above) that the Commission should regularise the position by using their plenary powers to suppress both the generic name *Clavellarius* Olivier, 1789, and its emendation *Clavellaria* Lamarck, 1801. No objection to the action proposed had been received from any source. Since the object of this proposal was to complete the action necessary to confer availability upon another generic name (*Cimbex* Olivier) and to secure that neither of the names to be suppressed should be available for use in any other sense as from some later date, the suppression should, as agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, be limited to suppression for the purposes of Article 25 (Law of Priority) and should not affect the status of the names concerned in relation to Article 34 (Law of Homonymy).

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 23)

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to suppress for the purposes of Article 25 the under-mentioned generic names :—

Clavellarius Olivier, 1789
Clavellaria Lamarck, 1801 ;

(2) to place the generic names specified in (1) above on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to render an *Opinion*, supplementary to *Opinion* 144, recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

" Bombus " Latreille, 1802 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) : validation of, under the plenary powers, in so far as necessary.

41. THE COMMISSION had before them an application (file Z.N.(S.) 133) submitted by Mr. R. B. Benson (British Museum (Natural History), London), M. Ch. Ferrière (then of the Commonwealth (at that time Imperial) Institute of Entomology, London) and Dr. O. W. Richards (Imperial College of Science and Technology, London) that the plenary powers should be used to conserve the well-known generic name *Bombus* Latreille, 1802 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 204). In submitting this proposal the foregoing specialists were acting as members of the Hymenoptera Sub-Committee of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature of the Royal Entomological Society of London and it was at the request of those bodies that the application had been laid before the Commission.

(*Previous reference Lisbon Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion* 13)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that at the time when the present application was submitted to the Commission the name *Bombus* Latreille was in universal use among hymenopterists, other than those who had recognised the names published in the "Erlangen List" of 1801. In 1935, however, the Commission had used their plenary powers to suppress that List (*Opinion* 135) and in consequence the name *Bremus* Jurine, 1801, of that List (which, as explained, had been used by some hymenopterists in preference to *Bombus* Latreille) had ceased to have any nomenclatorial standing. Unfortunately, however, that decision had not completely cleared the way for the universal acceptance of the name *Bombus* Latreille, 1802, for there remained the name *Bremus* as published by Panzer-Jurine in Part 85 (pls. 19–21) of the *Faun. Ins. germ.*, which was attributed by some authors to 1801, and thus, if this date was correct, had priority over *Bombus* Latreille. Since the present application was submitted, Miss G. A. Sandhouse (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) had published (1943) a review of the type species of the genera of bees, in which she had expressed the view that the date of publication of the name *Bremus* in the *Faun. Ins. germ.* was uncertain and had stated that, according to Sherborn, the correct date was "1804." She had accordingly taken the view that the name *Bombus* Latreille had priority over the name *Bremus* Panzer-Jurine. She had agreed generally with the proposal that the name *Bremus* should be suppressed, if necessary.

Continuing, the Acting President said the only entomologist who had notified the Commission of any criticism to the action proposed in this case was Dr. Richard Blackwelder (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) who had stated that he had strong personal objection to that proposal, on the ground that, in his view, the data furnished in support of the action proposed were not sufficient to justify the use of the plenary powers. Finally, he had to report that he had been informed by Commissioner Mortensen (Denmark) that, if he had been able to attemd the present meeting, he would have voted in favour of the present proposal. The Acting President added that, speaking personally as a member of the Commission, he felt bound to express the view that an extremely well-known name such as *Bombus* Latreille should not be discarded lightly for purely nomenclatorial reasons, in view of the extensive literature associated with that name. This name fell within the class of names covered by the resolution adopted at the meeting of the Commission held jointly with the Section on Nomenclature (as noted in the margin) in which the Commission were enjoined to give specially sympathetic consideration to applications submitted for the use of the plenary powers for the purpose of preventing the upsetting of well-known names. It would, in his opinion, be particularly wrong for the Commission to countenance the upsetting of such a name where, as in the present instance, there was substantial doubt as to the validity of the claims advanced in favour of the priority of the allegedly older name. He therefore recommended that the Commission should accept the view that the name *Bombus* Latreille should be preserved. In existing circumstances, this object could, it appeared, be achieved by the Commission placing the name *Bombus* Latreille on the " Official List " without recourse to the use of their plenary powers. In order however, to ward against the risk that it might later be established that *Bremus* Jurine (as published in Part 85 of the *Faun. Ins. germ.*) had been published before the name *Bombus* Latreille and therefore that the entry of that name on the " Official List " was invalid, it would be prudent if the Commission were to follow a precedent which they had adopted in similar cases in the past and were accordingly now to use their plenary powers to such extent, if any, as might be necessary to validate the name *Bombus* Latreille, 1802, as against the name *Bremus* Panzer-Jurine, a name at the present time of indeterminate date.

(*Previous reference Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 13)

General agreement was expressed with the view submitted by the Acting President and with the course of action which he had recommended.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to such extent, if any, as might be necessary to validate the name *Bombus* Latreille, 1802 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) as against the name *Bremus* Panzer-Jurine (as published in Part 85 of the *Faun. Ins. germ.*), a name of at present indeterminate date, in the event of it later being established that that name had priority over *Bombus* Latreille, 1802 ;

(2) to place the name *Bombus* Latreille, 1802 (type species, by monotypy: *Apis terrestris* Linnaeus, 1758), validated, to such extent, if any, as might be necessary, under the decision taken in (1) above, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " and the name *Bremus* Panzer-Jurine [1801–1804], on the corresponding " Official Index ";

(3) to place the trivial name *terrestris* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Apis terrestris*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology ";

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

" Ceratina " Latreille [1802-1803], and " Diodontus " Curtis, 1834 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) (applications for use of plenary powers for) : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained

42. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the under-mentioned applications (file Z.N.(S.)133) submitted by Mr. R. B. Benson (British Museum (Natural History), London), M. Ch. Ferrière (then of the Commonwealth (at that time Imperial) Institute of Entomology, London) and Dr. O. W. Richards (Imperial College of Science and Technology, London) for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers :—

(a) an application for the validation of the generic name *Ceratina* Latreille, [1802–1803] (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) by the suppression of the earlier name *Clavicera* Latreille [1802] (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 205);

(b) an application that the Commission should designate *Pemphredon tristis* Van der Linden, 1829, as the type species of the genus *Diodontus* Curtis, 1834 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera), a well-known genus round which a considerable volume of bionomic and zoogeographical literature had grown up (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 206).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, as in the application relating to the name *Bombus* Latreille which had just been considered by the Commission, the specialists by whom the present applications had been prepared had submitted those applications to the Committee on Generic Nomenclature of the Royal Entomological Society of London in their capacity as members of the Hymenoptera Sub-Committee of that Committee. These applications had been submitted to the Commission by the Royal Entomological Society on the advice of the above Committee. Only one objection to the action proposed had been received. This was contained in a letter from Dr. Richard Blackwelder (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) who had entered a strong personal objection on the ground that the evidence submitted was not sufficient to justify the use of the plenary powers in these cases. The Commission, in considering these applications, would no doubt give full weight to this aspect of the question.

In the subsequent discussion the view was expressed that there might well be strong grounds for the use of the plenary powers in these cases but that, as submitted, these applications did not clearly show that greater confusion than uniformity would ensue, if the plenary powers were not used. In the circumstances the best course would be to refer these applications back to the applicants with a request for further information on the foregoing question.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the information in their possession on the question whether the strict application of the *Règles* in the case of the names *Ceratina* Latreille [1802–1803], and *Diodontus* Curtis, 1834 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) would lead to greater confusion than uniformity was not sufficient to show whether in these cases the plenary powers should be used in the manner proposed;

(2) to notify the foregoing conclusion to the Royal Entomological Society of London and at the same time to ask for supplementary statements setting out the nature and extent of the confusion apprehended by the Society if the *Règles* were strictly applied in the cases specified in (1) above ;

(3) to defer taking a decision on either of the applications referred to above, until the supplementary statement in regard thereto, asked for in (2) above, was available.

" Formica " Linnaeus, 1758, and " Camponotus " Mayr, 1861 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) : addition of, to the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology "

43. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) an application (file Z.N.(S.)133) submitted by Mr. R. B. Benson (British Museum (Natural History), London), M. Ch. Fèrrière (then of the Commonwealth (at that time Imperial) Institute of Entomology, London) and Dr. O. W. Richards (Imperial College of Science and Technology, London) that the Commission should use their plenary powers to preserve the existing usage of the generic names *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Camponotus* Mayr, 1861 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) by cancelling the selection by Latreille (1810) of *Formica herculeana* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758 (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 207);

(b) a note by the Secretary to the Commission pointing out that under the decision taken by the Commission at Lisbon to amplify the interpretation of Article 30 in relation to Latreille, 1810, *Consid. gén. Crust. Arach. Ins.*, given in *Opinion* 11, a decision which was later (1939) embodied in *Opinion* 136, the difficulty which the present application was designed to overcome had disappeared, for, under the amplified interpretation given in *Opinion* 136, the action taken by Latreille in 1810 did not constitute a selection of *Formica herculeana* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758 (Hemming, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 207 *nota* 11).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, for the reasons explained in the note which he had published in the previous year, all difficulty in this case had disappeared and the ground was clear therefore for the names *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Camponotus* Mayr, 1861, to be added to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" without resort by the Commission to their plenary powers.

THE COMMISSION agreed:—

(1) that no type selection within the meaning of Rule (g) in Article 30 was made for the genus *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, by Latreille in 1810 (*Consid. gén. Crust. Arach. Ins.*), that under the *Règles* the type species of this genus was *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758, that species having been the first of the originally included species to have been duly so selected under Rule (g) in Article 30 (by Curtis, 1839), and therefore that no question arose of the Commission having to use their plenary powers to designate that species as the type species of the foregoing genus;

(2) to place the under-mentioned generic names with the type species severally specified below on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology":—

Formica Linnaeus, 1758 (type species, by selection by Curtis, 1839: *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758)

Camponotus Mayr, 1861 (type species, by selection by Bingham, 1903 : *Formica ligniperda* Latreille, 1802) ;

(3) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " :—

rufa Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Formica rufa*)

ligniperda Latreille, 1802 (as published in the binominal combination *Formica ligniperda*) ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

" Gorytes " Latreille [Sept., 1804], " Harpactus " Shuckard, 1837, " Macropis " Panzer, [1806-1809] (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) (applications for use of plenary powers for) : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained

44. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the under-mentioned applications (file Z.N.(S.)133) relating to generic names in the Order Hymenoptera (Class Insecta) submitted by Mr. R. B. Benson (British Museum (Natural History), London), M.Ch. Ferrière (then of the Commonwealth (at that time Imperial) Institute of Entomology, London) and Dr. O. W. Richards (Imperial College of Science and Technology, London) :—

(a) an application for the validation of the generic name *Gorytes* Latreille, [Sept., 1804] (*in* Sonnini's Buffon, *Hist.nat.gén.partic.Crust.Ins.* 13 : 308) type species, by selection by Latreille, 1810 : *Sphex mystacea* Linnaeus, 1761) by the suppression under the plenary powers of the generic name *Gorytes* Latreille [March, 1804] (*Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat.* **24** : 180) (type species, by monotypy : *Mellinus quinquecinctus* Fabricius, 1793), with the consequent automatic validation of the generic name *Hoplisus* Lepeletier, 1832 (type species, by selection by Westwood, 1839 : *Mellinus quinquecinctus* Fabricius, 1793) (Benson, Ferrière, & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 208) ;

(b) an application (i) for the suppression under the plenary powers of the name *Harpactus* (emend. of *Arpactus*) Panzer, 1806, and of all subsequent uses of either name prior to Shuckard, 1837, and (ii) for the validation of the generic name *Harpactus* as from Shuckard, 1837, with *Arpactus formosus* Jurine, 1807 (=*Mutilla laevis* Latreille, 1792) as type species (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 209) ;

(c) an application for the validation of the generic name *Macropis* Panzer [1806–1809] (type species, by monotypy : *Macropis labiata* Fabricius [1804–1805]) by suppressing, under the plenary powers, the selection of the above species by Westwood (1840) as the type species of the genus *Megilla* Fabricius [1804–1805] (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 210).

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusion 42)

The view was expressed that the foregoing applications were incomplete in the same respects as those relating to the names *Ceratina* Latreille [1802–1803], and *Diodontus* Curtis, 1834. It was felt therefore that the two sets of applications should be treated in a similar manner and that consideration of the present applications should be postponed for the purpose of enabling additional information to be obtained.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the information in their possession on the question whether the strict application of the *Règles* in the case of the names *Gorytes* Latreille [Sept. 1804], *Harpactus* (emend. of *Arpactus*) Panzer, 1806, and *Macropis* Panzer [1806–1809] (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) would lead to greater confusion than uniformity was not sufficient to show whether in these cases the plenary powers should be used in the manner proposed ;

(2) to notify the foregoing conclusion to the Royal Entomological Society of London (through which the foregoing applications had been submitted to the Commission) and at the same time to ask for supplementary statements setting out the nature and extent of the confusion apprehended by the Society if the *Règles* were strictly applied in the cases specified in (1) above, and, in the case of the name *Arpactus* Panzer, 1806, the grounds on which Shuckard's emendation to *Harpactus* was thought to be justified under Article 19 of the *Règles* ;

(3) to defer taking a decision on any of the applications referred to above, until the supplementary statements in regard thereto, asked for in (2) above, were severally available.

" Megachile " Latreille, 1802 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) : type species of, determined

45. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) an application (file Z.N.(S.)133) submitted by Mr. R. B. Benson (British Museum (Natural History), London), M.Ch. Ferrière (then of the Commonwealth (at that time Imperial) Institute of Entomology, London), and Dr. O. W. Richards (Imperial College of Science and Technology, London) that the Commission should use their plenary powers to suppress the selection by Latreille (1810) of *Apis muraria* Retzius, 1783, as the type species of the genus *Megachile* Latreille, 1802 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) and to designate in the place of that species *Apis centuncularis* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of this genus (i.e., the species so selected by Curtis in 1828) (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 211);

(Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion 1)

(b) a note by the Secretary to the Commission pointing out that, under the decision taken by the Commission at Lisbon to amplify the interpretation of Article 30 in relation to Latreille, 1810, *Consid. gén. Crust. Arach. Ins.*, given in *Opinion* 11, a decision which was later (1939) embodied in *Opinion* 136, the difficulty which the present application was designed to overcome had disappeared, for, under the amplified interpretation given in *Opinion* 136, the action taken by Latreille in 1810 did not constitute a selection of *Apis centuncularis* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Megachile* Latreille, 1802 (Hemming, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 211, *nota* 20).

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusion 43)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present case was similar to that of *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, which the Commission had considered a few minutes earlier, for in each case the difficulty which had confronted the applicants was due to the incomplete and partially misleading interpretation of Article 30 given in the Commission's *Opinion* 11. In each case the difficulties in question had disappeared as soon as the amplification of *Opinion* 11 agreed upon at Lisbon became available through the publication of *Opinion* 136. Now that it was realised that Latreille (1810) did not select a type species for the genus *Megachile* Latreille, 1802, it was found that the next type selection, that by Curtis (1828), was perfectly satisfactory, for that author had selected as the type species of this genus the species, *Apis centuncularis* Linnaeus, 1758, which the applicants had asked the Commission to use their plenary powers so to designate. The ground was thus cleared for the name *Megachile* Latreille, 1802, to be placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " without resort by the Commission to their plenary powers.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that no type selection within the meaning of Rule (g) in Article 30 having been made for the genus *Megachile* Latreille, 1802, by Latreille in 1810 (*Consid. gén. Crust. Arach. Ins.*) under the *Règles*, the type species of this genus was *Apis centuncularis* Linnaeus, 1758, that species being the first of the originally included species to have been duly so selected under Rule (g) in Article 30 (by Curtis, 1828), and therefore that no question arose of the Commission having to use their plenary powers to designate that species as the type species of the foregoing genus ;

(2) to place the generic name *Megachile* Latreille, 1802 (type species, by selection by Curtis, 1828 : *Apis centuncularis* Linnaeus, 1758) on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the specific trivial name *centuncularis* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Apis centuncularis*) on the " Officia List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

Seven generic names in the Order Hymenoptera (Class Insecta) (applications for use of plenary powers for) : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained

46. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the under-mentioned applications (file Z.N.(S.)133) relating to the proposed use of the plenary powers in the manner indicated below submitted by Mr. R. B. Benson (British Museum (Natural History), London), M. Ch. Ferrière (then of the Commonwealth (at that time Imperial) Institute of Entomology, London) and Dr. O. W. Richards (Imperial College of Science and Technology, London) :—

" Methocha " Latreille [March, 1804]

(a) an application (i) for the recognition of the emendation to *Methoca* of the spelling of the generic name published by Latreille in 1804 as *Methocha* and (ii) for the validation of the specific name *Methoca ichneumonides* Latreille, [Sept. 1804] as the name of the type species of the genus *Methoca* Latreille [March 1804], by the suppression, under the plenary powers, of the specific name *Mutilla articulata* Latreille, 1792, previously bestowed upon that species. (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 212) ;

" Notozus " Förster, 1853

(b) an application for the validation of the generic name *Notozus* Förster, 1853 (type species, by selection by Ashmead, 1902 : *Hedychrum spina* Lepeletier, 1806) by the suppression, under the plenary powers, of the generic name *Elampus* Spinola, 1806, the type species of which, *Chrysis panzeri* Fabricius, [1804–1805] (by selection by Latreille, 1810) is regarded by specialists as subjectively identical with the type species of the genus *Notozus* Förster (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 213);

"Nysso" Latreille, 1796

(c) an application for the use of the plenary powers to emend to *Nysson* the spelling of the generic name originally published as *Nysso* Latreille, 1796 (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 214);

"Odynerus" Latreille, [1802-1803]

(d) an application for the suppression, under the plenary powers, of the selection by Westwood (1840) of *Vespa muraria* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Odynerus* Latreille, [1802–1803] (a genus based upon a misidentified type species) and the designation in the place of that species of *Vespa spinipes* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of this genus (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 215);

"Ponera" Latreille, 1804

(e) an application for the suppression, under the plenary powers, of the selection by Latreille (1810) of *Formica crassinoda* Latreille, 1802, as the type species of *Ponera* Latreille, 1804, and the designation in the place of that species of *Formica contracta* Latreille, 1802, as the type species of this genus (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 216);

"Rhopalum" Stephens, 1829

(f) an application for the validation of the generic name *Rhopalum* Stephens, 1829 (type species, by selection by Curtis, 1837 : *Crabro rufiventris* Panzer, 1799) by the suppression, under the plenary powers, of the generic name *Euplilis* Risso, 1826, the type species of which is the same species (by selection by Pate, 1935) (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 217);

"Solenius" Lepeletier and Brullé, 1835

(g) an application for the suppression of the selection by Westwood (1839) of *Sphex vaga* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Solenius* Lepeletier and Brullé, 1835 (a genus based on a misidentified type species) and the designation in place of that species of *Crabro continuus* Fabricius [1804–1805] (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 218).

The view was expressed that in these cases also, as in the applications considered in Conclusions 42 and 44 above, the information available was not sufficient to enable a decision to be reached on the question whether the plenary powers should be used in the manner proposed, and therefore that the consideration of these applications should be postponed until additional information was available. In addition in the case of the applications relating to *Methocha* Latreille [March 1804], and *Nysso* Latreille, 1796, it was felt that, before the Commission could consider whether the plenary powers should be used in relation to *Methocha* Latreille [March 1804], and *Nysso* statements should be furnished discussing the question whether these emendations could not be made under Article 19, without the use of the plenary powers.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the information in their possession on the question whether the strict application of the *Règles* in the case of the under-mentioned seven generic names in the Order Hymenoptera (Class Insecta) would lead to greater confusion than uniformity was not sufficient to show whether in these cases the plenary powers should be used in the manner proposed :—

(a) *Methocha* Latreille [March 1804] ;
(b) *Notozus* Förster, 1853 ;
(c) *Nysso* Latreille, 1796 ;
(d) *Odynerus* Latreille [1802–1803] ;
(e) *Ponera* Latreille, 1804 ;
(f) *Rhopalum* Stephens, 1829 ;
(g) *Solenius* Lepeletier and Brullé, 1835 ;

(2) to notify the foregoing conclusion to the Royal Entomological Society of London (through which the foregoing applications had been submitted to the Commission) and at the same time to ask for supplementary statements setting out the nature and extent of the confusion apprehended by the Society if the *Règles* were strictly applied in the cases specified in (1) above, and, in the case of the names *Methocha* Latreille, 1804 (case (a) above) and *Nysso* Latreille, 1796 (case (c) above), discussing the question whether or not these emendations could properly be made under Article 19, a question on which the Commission would need to reach a decision before considering whether the use of the plenary powers in the case of these names would be appropriate ;

(3) to defer taking decisions on the applications referred to above until the supplementary statements in regard thereto, asked for in (2) above were severally available.

Two species in the Order Hymenoptera (Class Insecta) (proposed use of the plenary powers to conserve the trivial names in common use for) : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained.

47. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the under-mentioned applications (files Z.N.(S.)134 and 135) for the stabilisation, under the plenary powers, of the trivial names shown below for two species in the Order Hymenoptera (Class Insecta), submitted by Mr. R. B. Benson (British Museum (Natural History), London), M. Ch. Ferrière (then of the Commonwealth (at that time Imperial) Institute of Entomology, London), and Dr. O. W. Richards (Imperial College of Science and Technology, London) :—

(a) an application (file Z.N.(S.)134) for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to secure that the trivial name *arvensis* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Vespa arvensis*) shall continue to be used for the species commonly known as *Mellinus arvensis* (Linnaeus) (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 219) ;

(b) an application (file Z.N.(S.)135) for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to secure that the trivial name *agrorum* Fabricius, 1787 (as published in the binominal combination *Apis agrorum*) shall continue to be used for the species commonly known as *Bombus agrorum* (Fabricius) (e.g., as defined by Saunders, 1896, *Hymen. Acul. Brit. Islands* : 367).

The view was expressed that the foregoing applications were incomplete in the same respects as those considered in Conclusions 42, 44 and 46 above, the information available not being sufficient to enable a decision to be reached on the question whether the plenary powers should be used in the manner proposed. It was accordingly felt that these applications also should be postponed until additional information was available. It would be convenient also if when that information was asked for, a request were added for the addition of a bibliographic reference to the use of the trivial name *arvensis* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the combination *Vespa arvensis*) in the sense in which it was desired that that name should be stabilised, similar to the corresponding reference included in the application submitted for the stabilisation of the trivial name *agrorum* Fabricius, 1787 (as published in the combination *Apis agrorum*) (file Z.N.(S.) 135).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the information in their possession on the question whether the strict application of the *Règles* in relation to the trivial names *arvensis* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Vespa arvensis*) and *agrorum* Fabricius, 1787 (as published in the binominal combination *Apis agrorum*) would lead to greater confusion than uniformity was not sufficient to show whether in these cases the plenary powers should be used in the manner proposed ;

(2) to notify the foregoing conclusion to the Royal Entomological Society of London (through which the foregoing applications had been submitted to the Commission) and at the same time to ask for supplementary statements setting out the nature and extent of the confusion apprehended by the Society if the *Règles* were strictly applied in the cases specified in (1) above, and in the case of the first of the names in question, to cite a bibliographical reference to the use of the trivial name *arvensis* Linnaeus, 1758, in the sense in which it is desired that that name should be stabilised ;

(3) to defer decisions on the applications specified in (1) above until the supplementary statements, asked for in (2) above, were severally available.

" Erycina " Lamarck, 1805 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Heterodonta): designation of type species of, under the plenary powers

48. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.) 69) submitted by Dr. Harald A. Rehder (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.), for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to set aside the selection made by Anton (1839) under Rule (g) of Article 30 of *Erycina elliptica* Lamarck, 1805, as the type species of the genus *Erycina* Lamarck, 1805 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Heterodonta) and in place to designate *Erycina pellucida* Lamarck, 1805, as the type species of this genus (Rehder, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 221–222). In submitting this application, Dr. Rehder had expressed the view that the acceptance of *Erycina elliptica* Lamarck, 1805, as the type species of this genus would mean (i) that the name *Erycina* would be used for the group long known as *Diplodonta* Bronn and *Taras* Risso and (ii) that the genus *Erycina* of authors would need a new name. Dr. Rehder had added that this transposition would cause endless confusion, especially as both groups were common as Tertiary fossils and were used as index fossils in stratigraphy.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the foregoing application had been considered by the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America which, by a majority of ten votes to one had voted in favour of supporting the use of the plenary powers in the manner proposed. No objection to the proposal had been received from any source.

THE COMMISSION agreed

(1) to use their plenary powers :—
  (a) to set aside all selections of the type species of the genus *Erycina* Lamarck, 1805 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Heterodonta) made prior to the present decision ;
  (b) to designate *Erycina pellucida* Lamarck, 1805, to be the type species of the foregoing genus ;

(2) to place the generic name *Erycina* Lamarck, 1805, with the type species specified in (1)(b) above, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology";

(3) to place the trivial name *pellucida* Lamarck, 1805 (as published in the binominal combination *Erycina pellucida*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

Gesner, 1758, " Tractatus physicus de petrificatis " : suppression of, for nomenclatorial purposes, under the plenary powers

49. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)146) submitted by Dr. J. Brookes Knight (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) on the subject of the status of names as published by Gesner (J.) in 1758 in his *Tractatus physicus de petrificatis* (Knight, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 222). In submitting this application, Dr. Knight had explained that in this work Gesner had published Latin designations which appeared to be generic names but had published no trivial names for species. Some of these designations had been used as generic names by later authors, by whom species had been referred to the genera in question. Since about 1830, the use of most of these names (all of which ended in "-ites ") had been discontinued. The few which remained in use were attributed to authors subsequent to Gesner. Dr. Knight had submitted two requests to the Commission : (1) that they should give a ruling on the question whether names published by Gesner in his *Tractatus* of 1758 were available under the *Règles*, (2) that, if the answer to the foregoing question were to be in the affirmative, the Commission should use their plenary powers to render those names unavailable by suppressing the whole of the *Tractatus* for nomenclatorial purposes.

(For the decision to amend the wording of Proviso (b) *to Article* 25 *to read as here shown, see Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had been informed by the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America that, although it had not been found possible to take a vote of the members of the Joint Committee on this case, four of the members of the Committee (Wells, Moore, Cooper, Keen) had expressed themselves " as favouring suppression ". The Acting President added that, speaking as a member of the Commission, his own view was that Gesner's *Tractatus* was not a binominal work and therefore that the new " names " published therein could properly be rejected on the ground that in the *Tractatus* Gesner had not complied with the requirements of Proviso (b) to Article 25 (that is to say, he had not " appliqué les principes de la nomenclature binominale "). If the Commission possessed a salaried staff and were thus able themselves to undertake detailed research on problems arising out of applications submitted to them, the ideal course in cases of this sort would be for them to investigate in detail the question whether a given book complied with the requirements of Proviso (b) to Article 25 and to reserve the use of their plenary powers for those cases where it was clear that the work in question was a binominal work but where the use of the new names published in that work would lead to greater confusion than uniformity. However, with its limited funds and its honorary spare-time staff, the Commission could not normally undertake investigations of this sort. In existing conditions, it was therefore frequently necessary for the Commission to consider jointly the question whether a given work was an available work and the question whether it was desirable that, if the answer to the first question was in the affirmative, the plenary powers should be used to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes any new names published in that work. This was apparently the course which has been followed by the American specialists to whom he had referred, for they had expressed themselves as being in favour of the suppression of Gesner's *Tractatus* under the plenary powers, without having expressed an opinion on the prior question whether in fact under the *Règles* that work was an available work. In the present case, he (the Acting President) thought that this was the right line to adopt. Every specialist who had expressed an opinion to the Commission was in favour of the rejection of the " names " published by Gesner. This being so, the method to be adopted to secure this end was purely one of machinery. The simplest method of achieving this object would be by the use of the plenary powers. This therefore was the course which he recommended the Commission to adopt.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note that the specialists who had expressed an opinion on the application submitted in regard to the treatment of new " names " published in 1758 in Gesner's *Tractatus physicus de petrificatis* were unanimous in considering that those " names " should not be accepted ;

(2) without prejudice to the question whether in his *Tractatus* of 1758 Gesner applied the principles of binominal nomenclature and therefore whether new " names " in that work possessed any availability under the *Règles*, agreed to use their plenary powers in so far as necessary to suppress the foregoing work for all nomenclatorial purposes;

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 47)

(3) placed on record that, in view of the decision specified in (2) above, any " name ", the first publication of which subsequent to 1757 was in Gesner's *Tractatus* of 1758, ranks for purposes of the Law of Priority (Article 25) and of the Law of Homonymy (Article 34) as from the date subsequent to the *Tractatus* on which it was first published in conditions which satisfy the requirements of Article 25 and is to be attributed to the author by whom it was so published ;

(4) agreed to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

" Liodes " Heyden, 1826 (Class Arachnida, Order Acarina) to be rejected as a homonym of " Leiodes " Latreille, 1796 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera)

50. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) an application (file Z.N.(S.)64) submitted by the late Dr. Arthur P. Jacot, asking for a ruling on the question whether the generic name *Liodes* Heyden 1826 (Class Arachnida, Order Acarina) should, under Article 34, be rejected as a homonym of the generic name *Leiodes* Latreille, 1796 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) (Jacot, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 223) ;

(b) a paper by the Secretary to the Commission pointing out that under Article 35(3), as applied to Article 34 (generic names) by *Opinion* 147, generic names differing from one another in spelling only in the manner shown in the example cited by Dr. Jacot (*Leiodes* and *Liodes*) were to be regarded as homonyms of one another in those cases where the names in question consisted of words having "the same origin and meaning" but not otherwise (Hemming, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 223–224).

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 41)

It was pointed out that the position in regard to these names must now be judged in the light of the criteria which it had been agreed to recommend should be inserted in Article 34. The view was expressed that there could be no reasonable doubt that these two names were based upon the same Greek word. They must therefore be regarded as homonyms of one another.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that *Leiodes* Latreille, 1796, and *Liodes* Heyden, 1826, are homonyms of one another and therefore that the name *Liodes* Heyden, 1826, as the later published of the two names, is invalid ;

(2) to place the name *Liodes* Heyden, 1826 (Class Arachnida, Order Acarina) on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

Report to the Congress on the work performed during the Paris Session : two supplementary points submitted to the Section on Nomenclature

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting Conclusion* 6)

51. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that, when at the joint meeting held at 0915 hours that morning the Section on Nomenclature had approved and adopted the Report adopted by the Commission for submission to the Congress at the final Plenary Session to be held on the morning of the following day (Tuesday, 27th July, 1948) and had invited him, as Secretary to the Commission, to present that Report to the Congress on their behalf with an indication that it had been approved and adopted by the Section on Nomenclature as well as by the Commission, the Section had agreed also that, if, as the result of discussions in the Section subsequent to the adoption of the Commission's Report, the Commission and the Section were to agree to make any additions to the Report, the additions so agreed upon should be made before the Report was submitted to the Congress.

There were two points arising out of this decision to which he (the Acting President) wished to refer. The first was concerned with the interpretation of the Report; the second involved the insertion in the Report of an additional sentence. As regards the first of these points, it was important that it should be clearly placed on record that the approval of the Commission's Report signified by the Section at their morning's meeting applied not only to the recommendations submitted to the Section by the Commission up to the time when at that meeting the approval of the Section was so signified but also to recommendations submitted by the Commission to the Section and approved by the Section in the period between the adoption by the Section of the Commission's Report and the close of the final meeting of the Section held during the present (Paris) Congress, for it was essential that at the final *Concilium Plenum* the Congress should be made fully aware of conclusions reached by the Section. In order to clear the position in this regard up to the close of the present meeting, he (the Acting President) proposed that the Commission should now formally adjourn for a few minutes to enable him on their behalf to invite the Section to place on record that the approval of the recommendations submitted by the Commission in regard to the amendment of the *Règles* recorded by the Section in approving and adopting the Commission's Report applied not only to the recommendations submitted to, and approved by, the Section up to that moment, but also to the recommendations similarly submitted and approved (1) in the portion of the 11th Meeting of the Commission (and the 3rd Meeting of the Section) held subsequent to the adoption thereat by the Section of the Commission's Report, (2) during the joint meeting held that afternoon at 1445 hours (i.e. at the 12th Meeting of the Commission and the 4th Meeting of the Section), and (3) during the present meeting (i.e. the 13th Meeting of the Commission and the 5th Meeting of the Section). The second of the points to which he (the Acting President) had referred was concerned with the insertion in the Commission's Report of a sentence referring to the fact that during the present (Paris) Session the Commission had reached decisions on a large number of applications submitted to them on individual nomenclatorial problems. He had always hoped, as had the other members of the Commission, that it would be possible to make progress in this field during the Paris Session, but it had not been possible for him to insert a reference to this matter in the draft Report (Commission Paper I.C.(48)20) which had been considered that morning, for up to that time the Commission had not been able to devote any time to the consideration of individual applications, the whole of their energies having been directed to the consideration of proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles*. Great progress had now, however, been made in this important part of the work of the Commission, and he (the Acting President) therefore suggested that the Commission should agree to insert in their Report a paragraph dealing with this matter and should invite the Section on Nomenclature to concur in this course.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to insert in their Report to the Congress on the work performed during the present (Paris) Session a paragraph recording that during that Session the Commission had reached decisions on a large number of applications on individual nomenclatorial problems which had been submitted to them and to invite the Section on Nomenclature to signify their approval of the addition to the Report of the foregoing paragraph ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion* 6(2)(b))

(2) in accordance with the procedure agreed upon earlier that day at the meeting noted in the margin, to request the Section to signify that the approval of the recommendations submitted by the Commission in regard to the amendment of the *Règles* expressed by the Section when, at the meeting referred to above, they had approved and adopted the Report prepared by the Commission for submission to the Congress at the final *Concilium Plenum* to be held on the following morning, should be held to cover also the recommendations further regarding the amendment of the *Règles* unanimously adopted by the Commission, in agreement with the Section, at the following joint meetings held during the present day :—

(a) the portion, subsequent to the adoption of the Commission's Report by the Commission and the Section, of the meeting held in the forenoon (11th Meeting of the Commission and 3rd Meeting of the Section) ;

(b) the meeting held that afternoon at 1445 hours (12th Meeting of the Commission and 4th Meeting of the Section) ;

(c) the meeting held on the same afternoon at 1730 hours (13th Meeting of the Commission and 5th Meeting of the Section) ;

(3) to recommend the Section on Nomenclature formally to take note of, and approve, the conclusions in regard to individual nomenclatorial problems reached by the Commission, in agreement with the Section, at the joint meetings of the Commission and the Section specified in (2) above ;

(4) to invite the Acting President, as Secretary to the Commission, to lay before the Section on Nomenclature the recommendations specified in (1) to (3) above and to seek the approval of the Section therefor.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned to enable the Acting President to submit the foregoing recommendations to the Section on Nomenclature.*)

(*On resumption*)

Fourteenth Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session : time appointed

(*Previous reference: Paris Session. 11th Meeting, Conclusion 2*)

52. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that there still remained a number of applications relating to individual cases, on which it was highly important that decisions should be reached before the close of the Congress. For this purpose, as had been foreseen at the first of the meetings held that day, it would be necessary for the Commission to hold a further meeting that evening after dinner. There would be no possibility of arranging for a meeting of the Section on Nomenclature to be held after that meeting for the purpose of taking note of conclusions then reached by the Commission or of considering any recommendations which the Commission might then agree to submit. In his capacity as President of the Section on Nomenclature, he proposed therefore that the evening meeting should, like the other meetings held that day, be a joint meeting of the Commission and the Section. As such, it would be open to any member of the Congress to take part in it. He proposed that the meeting should start at 2030 hours.

THE COMMISSION took note of, and approved, the proposals submitted by the Acting President.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned at* 1910 *hours.*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology,
Paris, 21st–27th July, 1948

CONCLUSIONS of the Fourteenth Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July 1948 at 2030 hours

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Sixth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature*)

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
Professor E. Beltrán (Mexico)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present :

Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (U.S.A.)

Part 10 of Volume 1 of the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature": applications published in, to be considered in turn
(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusion 28*)

1. THE COMMISSION had before them Part 10 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* containing 22 papers relating to 15 individual problems of nomenclature.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note that one of the papers published in Part 10 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* had already been considered at the meeting noted in the margin in connection with the problem of the nomenclature of Orders and higher taxonomic units ;

(2) agreed to examine, in turn, each of the remaining 14 applications, 21 papers relating to which had been published in the foregoing Part of the *Bulletin*.

" Raphistoma " Rafinesque, 1815, and " Belone " Oken, 1815 (Class Pisces, Order Synentognathi) suppressed and " Raphistoma " Hall, 1847 (Class Gastropoda, Order Archaeogastropoda) and " Belone " Cuvier, 1817 (Class Pisces, Order Synentognathi) validated, under the plenary powers

2. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) a joint application (file Z.N.(S.)145) from the undermentioned specialists in the field of Palaeozoic Gastropods and living fishes for the suppression under the plenary powers of the generic name *Raphistoma* Rafinesque, 1815 (Class Pisces, Order Synentognathi) and the validation under the same powers of the generic name *Raphistoma* Hall, 1847 (Class Gastropoda, Order Archaeogastropoda) :—

Dr. J. Brookes Knight (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.),

Dr. L. R. Cox (British Museum (Natural History), London) (see also (b) below);

Dr. K. P. Oakley (British Museum (Natural History), London),

Dr. Josiah Bridge (United States Geological Survey, Washington, D.C.),

Dr. Edwin Kirk (United States Geological Survey, Washington, D.C.),

the late Dr. J. R. Norman (formerly of the British Museum (Natural History), London),

Dr. Ethelwynn Trewavas (British Museum (Natural History), London),

the late Dr. E. O. Ulrich (formerly of the United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.),

Dr. Leonard P. Schultz (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.),

Professor George S. Myers (Natural History Museum, Stanford University, California, U.S.A.) (see also (c) below) (see Knight and the other specialists cited above, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 225–227) ;

(b) a supplementary note by Dr. L. R. Cox, explaining that, while he supported the use of the plenary powers in the present case (see (a) above), he was not altogether convinced that this course was necessary, believing that it was possible to argue that, under the *Règles*, *Raphistoma* Rafinesque, 1815, was a *nomen nudum* (not having been published with an " indication ") and therefore that the name *Raphistoma* Hall, 1847, was already an available name (Cox, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 227) ;

(c) a supplementary note by Professor George S. Myers (see (a) above), expressing doubts similar to those expressed by Dr. Cox (see (b) above) but, like Dr. Cox, supporting the use of the plenary powers, in order to prevent the confusion which would arise from the use of the name *Raphistoma* in ichthyology (Myers, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 227–228).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, subsequent to its publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, this application had been considered by the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Palaeontology in America, which had given it their support. Further, Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (San Diego, California, U.S.A.), had written a letter supporting the action proposed. On the question of the method to be adopted to secure the desired end, Mr. Baily had expressed a strong preference for proceeding by the plenary powers rather than by way of interpretation. He had added that, in addition to the reasons advanced in the application published in the *Bulletin*, there was another strong reason in favour of conserving the name *Raphistoma* Hall, for that genus presented features believed to be characteristic of the ancestral Gastropod, and in consequence the name *Raphistoma* was of special importance in discussions on primitive fossil molluscs of doubtful affinities. In addition, Dr. Robert R. Miller (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) had informed him (the Acting President) that he would be strongly opposed to the use of the name *Raphistoma* Rafinesque for a genus of fishes. No objection to the action proposed had been received from any source. Turning to the actual proposal itself, the Acting President said that, while the generic name *Raphistoma* Rafinesque had been introduced in a very unsatisfactory way, it could not, he thought, be claimed that it had been published without an " indication " in view of the reference to Gronovius which Rafinesque had given. If, therefore (as he hoped would be the case), the Commission agreed to approve the proposal submitted by Dr. Brookes Knight and his colleagues, it would be necessary to use the plenary powers. Further, he thought that it would be desirable that, if the Commission validated the name *Raphistoma* Hall (Class Gastropoda), they should validate also the name *Belone* Cuvier, 1817 (Class Pisces), the validity of which, as the applicants had pointed out, could not be established until the name *Raphistoma* Rafinesque had been suppressed. Incidentally, it would be necessary also to suppress the earlier name *Belone* Oken, 1816, in anticipation of a decision by the Commission on the general question of the availability of new names published in that author's *Lehrbuch.*

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

  (a) to suppress for all purposes the undermentioned generic names :—

    Raphistoma Rafinesque, 1815 (Class Pisces, Order Synentognathi),

    Belone Oken, 1815 (Class Pisces, Order Synentognathi) ;

  (b) to validate the undermentioned generic names :—

    Raphistoma Hall, 1847 (Class Gastropoda, Order Archaeogastropoda),

    Belone Cuvier, 1817 (Class Pisces, Order Synentognathi) ;

(2) to place on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " the two generic names specified in (1)(a) above ;

(3) to place the undermentioned generic names ,with the type species severally specified below, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " :—

  (a) *Raphistoma* Hall, 1847 (type species, by selection by de Koninck, 1881 : *Maclurea striatus* Emmons, 1842) ;

  (b) *Belone* Cuvier, 1817 (type species, by absolute tautonymy : *Esox belone* Linnaeus, 1761) ;

(4) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " :—

  (a) *striatus* Emmons, 1842 (as published in the binominal combination *Maclurea striatus*) ;

  (b) *belone* Linnaeus, 1761 (as published in the binominal combination *Esox belone*) ;

(5) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (4) above.

" Teleosteus " Volger, 1860, and the trivial name " primaevus " Volger, 1860 (as

3. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.) 132) submitted by Dr. Adolf Zilch (Natur-Museum Senckenberg, Frankfurt a.M., Germany) asking the Commission to use their plenary

published in the combination " Teleosteus primaevus ") (Class Anthozoa) : suppression of, under the plenary powers

powers to suppress (i) the generic name *Teleosteus* Volger, 1860, and (ii) the trivial name *primaevus* Volger, 1860 (as published in the binominal combination *Teleosteus primaevus*) (Class Anthozoa) (Zilch, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 228–229). In this application Dr. Zilch explained that the foregoing generic and trivial names had been given by Volger to what he had believed was a fossil of an osseous fish, found in the Hunsrück-slate of Caub (Lower Devonian, Siegen division). In the preparation of a catalogue of the type specimens preserved in the Natur-Museum Senckenberg, Volger's unique type specimen had been found correctly arranged among the corals of the Hunsrück-slate. It was in fact a Devonian tetra-coral and was referable to the same species as that which Sandberger had named *Rhipidophyllum vulgare* in 1889. In the absence therefore of action by the Commission the generic name *Teleosteus* Volger, 1860, would replace the name *Rhipidophyllum* Sandberger, 1889, and the trivial name *primaevus* Volger, 1860, would replace the name *vulgare* Sandberger, 1889, for the tetra-coral which Volger had mistaken for a fossil fish. The name *Teleosteus* would be misleading for a genus of corals and its substitution for the name *Rhipidophyllum* would be objectionable in view of the designation " Rhipidophyllum-slate " introduced by Sandberger. It was for these reasons that the applicant invited the Commission to use their plenary powers in the manner proposed.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present application had received the support of the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America (by a majority of 10 votes to 1). Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (San Diego. California, U.S.A.) had also written to the Commission supporting the use of the plenary powers for the reasons stated in the application. No other specialist in the group concerned had expressed an opinion on the action proposed but an entomologist, Dr. Richard Blackwelder (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) had notified his strong personal objection to this proposal on the ground that the evidence brought forward in the application was not, in his view, sufficient to justify the use of the plenary powers.

IN DISCUSSION, the view was expressed that this was a case in which the plenary powers could appropriately be used and therefore that the application should be granted.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

- (a) to suppress the generic name *Teleosteus* Volger, 1860, and the trivial name *primaevus* Volger, 1860 (as published in the binominal combination *Teleosteus primaevus*) ;
- (b) to validate the generic name *Rhipidophyllum* Sandberger, 1889 and the trivial name *vulgare* Sandberger, 1889 (as published in the binominal combination *Rhipidophyllum vulgare*) ;

(2) to place the generic name *Teleosteus* Volger, 1860 on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the trivial name *primaevus* Volger, 1860 (as published in the binominal combination *Teleosteus primaevus*) on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to place the generic name *Rhipidophyllum* Sandberger, 1889, *Jahrb. nassau. Ver. Naturk.* **42** : 100 (Class Anthozoa) (type species, by monotypy ; *Rhipidophyllum vulgare* Sandberger, 1889), on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(5) to place the trivial name *vulgare* Sandberger, 1889 (as published in the binominal combination *Rhipidophyllum vulgare*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(6) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (5) above.

The trivial name " mcfarlandi " (as published in the binominal combination " Chromodoris mcfarlandi ") (Class Gastropoda, Order Opisthobranchia) : emendation of, to " macfarlandi " under Article 19

4. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.) 122) submitted by Dr. D. P. Costello (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, U.S.A.) asking for a ruling on the question whether the trivial name *mcfarlandi* Cockerell, 1902 (published in the binominal combination *Chromodoris mcfarlandi*) (Class Gastropoda, Order Opisthobranchia) should, under Article 19 of the *Règles*, be emended to *macfarlandi*, having regard to the fact that the author (Cockerell), when publishing this name, had stated that it had been selected in honour of Professor F. M. McFarland of Stanford University, whose name was actually not " McFarland " but " MacFarland " (Costello, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 232–233).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that on the evidence brought forward, it was "évident" that when, in publishing a trivial name for a new species of the genus *Chromodoris* Alder & Hancock, 1855 (Class Gastropoda, Order Opisthobranchia), dedicated in honour of a zoologist named "Macfarland", Cockerell (1902) had spelt that trivial name as "*mcfarlandi*" instead of "*macfarlandi*," a "faute d'orthographe" had been committed and therefore that, under Article 19, the trivial name in question should be emended to read "*macfarlandi*";

(2) to render an *Opinion* recording the decision specified in (1) above.

The species commonly treated as having been named "Piroplasma annulatum" by Dschunkowsky and Luhs in 1904 (Class Sporozoa) Order Coccidiida) : (identity of) : consideration postponed for further information to be obtained regarding date of publication

5. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) an application (file Z.N.(S.)122) submitted by Dr. G. Witenberg (Hebrew University Jerusalem) asking for a ruling on the question whether Sergent (1923) was justified under the *Règles* in rejecting the trivial name *annulatum* Dschunkowsky & Luhs (as published in the binominal combination *Piroplasma annulatum*) (Class Sporozoa, Order Coccidiida) on the ground that, when that name was first published, the nominal species so named was a composite species (Witenberg, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 223–224);

(b) a note by the Secretary to the Commission (i) drawing attention to the fact that, although the name *Piroplasma annulatum* was universally attributed to Dschunkowsky & Luhs as from their paper "Die Piroplasmen der Rinder" published in 1904, an examination of that paper showed that neither the above nor any other scientific name was on that occasion given by those authors to the species responsible for Piroplasmosis in Cattle then described and figured, and (ii) enumerating efforts, so far unsuccessful, made by himself, as Secretary to the Commission, to ascertain when and by whom the name *Piproplasma annulatum* had first been published in conditions which satisfied the requirements of the *Règles* (Hemming, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 234–236).

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the actual problem presented in this application offered no difficulty, in view of the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin to clarifiy the provisions of Article 31 in relation to the determination of the species to which a trivial name should apply when (as here) the nominal species to which it had originally been given was found to be a composite species. The feature of this case which was extraordinary was that, although this name had for over 40 years been treated by all authors as though it had been published in 1904 in the paper to which he had referred, not only was this not the case but it had so far proved impossible to determine with certainty where and by whom this name had first been published, despite the painstaking assistance of leading protozoologists. Even Dschunkowsky was unable to say when or where he had first published this name. The Commission would (the Acting President felt sure) wish to express its gratitude for the outstanding assistance rendered in this case both by Dr. C. M. Wenyon, C.M.G., C.B.E., F.R.S. (The Wellcome Foundation, London) and by Mr. D. A. E. Cabot, Chief Veterinary Officer of the United Kingdom Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries. The Acting President added that, while a decision could now readily be taken on the limited issue raised by Dr. Witenberg, it was, he thought, desirable that a final effort should be made to determine the place where the name *Piroplasma annulatum* had first been published before an *Opinion* was rendered in this case. In the meantime it was necessary to treat the name *Piroplasma annulatum* as having been first published in 1905 in the Report of the VIIIth International Veterinary Congress, Budapest, 1904, that being the earliest place of publication of the name in question which it had so far been possible to trace. The name should be attributed to Dschunkowshy & Luhs, on whose behalf it had been communicated to the Budapest Congress.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, pending the outcome of the further investigation referred to in (5) below, the name *Piroplasma annulatum* (Class Sporozoa, Order Coccidiida) should, on the information at present available, be treated as having been first published in 1905 in the *Report of the VIIIth International Veterinary Congress, Budapest*, 1904 : 290, where it appeared in a paper by Dschunkowsky & Luhs communicated to the Congress by M. G. Tartarowsky, and that this name should therefore be attributed to Dschunkowsky & Luhs, 1905 ;

(2) that Dr. E. Sergent was in error when in 1923 he rejected the trivial name *annulatum* Dschunkowsky & Luhs on the ground that, when that

name had been first published, it had been applied to a composite species (the one pathogenic, the other non-pathogenic), for under the *Règles* a trivial name cannot be rejected on this ground, it being necessary to determine the species to which the name should be applied by the means provided by Article 31 ;

(3) that Dr. Witenberg himself in his application to the Commission (1947) applied the provisions of Article 31 to the trivial name *annulatum* Dschunkowsky & Luhs, 1905, when he selected as the species to which that name should apply the pathogenic (as contrasted with the non-pathogenic) species included by Dschunkowsky & Luhs in the nominal species *Piroplasma annulatum* when they first published the name of that composite species, and therefore that the trivial names *parva* and *dispar*, as published by Sergent (1923) (in combination with the generic name *Theileria*) were objective synonyms of the trivial name *annulatum* Dschunkowsky & Luhs (as published in 1905 in combination with the generic name *Piroplasma*) ;

(4) to place on record their thanks to Dr. C. M. Wenyon (Wellcome Foundation, London) and Mr. D. A. E. Cabot, Chief Veterinary Officer, United Kingdom Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, for their assiduous efforts to assist in the investigation of the complex bibliographical problems involved in this case ;

(5) to invite the Secretary to the Commission to examine, in consultation with specialists, the question whether there was any prospect of obtaining more precise information regarding the date on which, and the place in which, the name *Piroplasma annulatum* was first published ;

(6) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above, as soon as the Secretary had either brought to a successful issue the inquiry referred to in (5) above or was satisfied that no further information regarding the date and place of first publication of the name *Piroplasma annulatum* was likely to be obtained.

" Tremataspis " Schmidt, 1866 (a genus based upon a misidentified type species) (Class

6. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)123) submitted by Dr. George M. Robertson (Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire, U.S.A.), asking the Commission to use their plenary powers

Cephalaspidomorphi, Order Osteostraci): designation of type species of, under the plenary powers

to designate *Trematuspis schmidti* Rohon, 1892 as the type species of the genus *Tremataspis* Schmidt, 1866 (Class Cephalaspidomorphi, Order Osteostraci) (Robertson, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 237–238). It was explained that this was a case of a genus based on a misidentified type species. Schmidt (1866) had established the genus *Tremataspis* for a single species which, in fact, at that time was undescribed and unnamed and had misidentified that species with the species *Cephalaspis schrenkii* Pander, 1856. Under the presumption (laid down in *Opinion* 168) that the author of a genus is to be assumed to have identified correctly the species referred by him thereto, the type species of the genus *Tremataspis* Schmidt was the true *Cephalaspis schrenkii* of Pander. The recognition of this species as the type species of *Tremataspis* Schmidt would run counter to existing practice, would upset the family name TREMATASPIDAE and would lead to confusion. It was for these reasons that the Commission were asked to use their plenary powers to validate existing nomenclatorial practice by designating *Tremataspis schmidti* Rohon, 1892 (the species on which, in fact, Schmidt based the genus *Tremataspis*), as the type species of the genus *Tremataspis* Schmidt, 1866.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present was a clear case of a genus based upon a misidentified type species. The proposal submitted by Dr. Robertson had received the support of the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America, which (by a majority of 7 votes to 3) had passed a resolution in its favour. No other specialists in the group concerned had expressed opinions on the action proposed, but an entomologist, Dr. Richard Blackwelder (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) had notified his strong personal oppostion to this proposal on the ground that in his (Dr. Blackwelder's) opinion, the evidence brought forward in the application was not sufficient to justify the use of the plenary powers.

IN DISCUSSION the view was expressed that this case fell within the ambit of *Opinions* 65 and 168 and should therefore be granted.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to set aside the type designation made by Schmidt for, and all subsequent selections of type species made prior to the present decision in respect of, the genus *Tremataspis* Schmidt, 1866 (Class Cephalaspidomorphi, Order Osteostraci) ;

(b) to designate *Tremataspis schmidti* Rohon, 1892, to be the type species of the foregoing genus ;

(2) to place the generic name *Tremataspis* Schmidt, 1866, with the type species designated in (1)(b) above, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the trivial name *schmidti* Rohon, 1892 (as published in the binominal combination *Tremataspis schmidti*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

" Anomia pecten " Linnaeus, 1758 : identification of, under the plenary powers, with the species of the Order Protremata (Class Brachiopoda) commonly known as " Strophomena pecten " (Linnaeus, 1758)

7. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)130) submitted by Dr. Alan Wood (Imperial College of Science and Technology, London) asking the Commission to use their plenary powers to identify *Anomia pecten* Linnaeus, 1758, with the species belonging to the Order Protremata (Class Brachiopoda) commonly known as *Strophomena pecten* (Linnaeus, 1758) (Wood, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 239). It was explained that the above was the sense in which this Linnean name was currently used, but an examination of the figure quoted by Linnaeus in his original description (Lister's pl. 9, fig. 49) represented an entirely different species, namely the lamellibranch *Pecten papyraceus* Sowerby, 1822 (now commonly known as *Pterinopecten papyraceus* (Sowerby, 1822)). Both the brachiopod and the lamellibranch were widely distributed species and for over 100 years had been cited by many authors under the trivial names *pecten* Linnaeus and *papyraceus* Sowerby respectively. Great confusion would ensue if it were necessary to transfer the first of these names to the lamellibranch (*papyraceus* Sowerby).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that this proposal had been considered by the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America, which (by a majority of 9 votes to 2) had adopted a resolution supporting the action proposed. In addition, Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (San Diego, California, U.S.A.) had informed the Commission that he favoured the use of the plenary powers in this case. No objection to this proposal had been received from any source. The present petition arose from a situation which occurred not uncommonly in connection with Linnean names, for, as he had himself found when he was working on the Linnean butterflies, Linnaeus (by his own admission) had on occasion taken at second hand bibliographical references furnished to him, at his own invitation, by correspondents who had access to books not accessible to himself. It might be that this was what had happened in the present instance. If, as he hoped, the Commission approved the present proposal, it would be necessary to tie down the identity of the species to which in future the trivial name *pecten* Linnaeus, 1758, was to apply by anchoring it to a well authenticated description or figure of the species now known as *Strophomena pecten* (Linnaeus, 1758).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to direct that the trivial name *pecten* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Anomia pecten*) should apply to the species of the Order Protremata of the Class Brachiopoda, commonly known as *Strophomena pecten* (Linnaeus, 1758), i.e. the species determined as *Schellwienella pecten* (Linnaeus, 1758) by Dalman (J. W.), 1828, *K. svenska Vetensk. Akad. Handl.*, 1827 : 110 pl. 1, figs. 6a–d (as *Orthis pecten*) ;

(2) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " :—

pecten Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Anomia pecten*), as identified in (1) above ;

papyraceus Sowerby, 1822 (as published in the binominal combination *Pecten papyraceus*) ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

" Chinchilla " Bennett, 1829 (Class Mammalia, Order Rodentia), question of type species of : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained

8. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.) 141) submitted by the late Dr. Wilfred H. Osgood (Chicago, U.S.A.) for a ruling on the question of the species to be accepted as the type species of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829 (Class Mammalia, Order Rodentia) (Osgood, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 240–242). In this paper Dr. Osgood explained that Bennett had established the genus *Chinchilla* on the basis of the Chilean species (or subspecies) of the true " Chinchilla." Bennett did not designate a type species for the genus *Chinchilla*, but for the reason explained it was none the less clearly monotypical. Unfortunately, however, Bennett had applied to the single species which he described the name *Chinchilla lanigera*, not as a new name but as the feminine form of the earlier name *Mus laniger* Molina, 1782. A careful examination by Prell (1934) of Molina's, description had led that specialist to conclude that the species described by Molina was not a true " Chinchilla " but was the so-called " False Chinchilla " or Chinchilla Rat, which was currently placed in the genus *Abrocoma* Waterhouse, 1837, and did not belong even to the same family as the true Chinchilla. Three forms of true Chinchilla were recognised by specialists (from Chile, Peru and Bolivia respectively). The first of these to receive a name (*Eriomys chinchilla* Lichtenstein, 1829) could not be regarded as the type species of Bennett's genus *Chinchilla*, for that nominal species was based on the Peruvian animal, whereas Bennett's genus was based on that from Chile. Dr. Osgood had concluded that, owing to the prolonged misuse of Molina's trivial name *laniger*, the true Chinchilla from Chile did not receive a scientific name until in 1934 Prell named it *Chinchilla velligera*. If the Chinchilla Rat (*Mus laniger* Molina) were to be recognised as the type species of *Chinchilla* Bennett in place of the true Chinchilla, long-continued confusion of technical and vernacular names would be inevitable. These difficulties would be completely avoided it if were possible to set aside the claim of the name *Mus laniger* Molina, 1782, to be taken into account in considering the question of the type species of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had discussed this case with Dr. Philip Hershkovitch while in Chicago during his recent visit to the United States. He had then asked Dr. Hershkovitz to furnish him with a statement setting out his views. Dr. Hershkovitz had now done this. In this statement he took the view (1) that the *Mus laniger* of Molina, 1782, was a composite nominal species based in part upon the true *Chinchilla* of Chile (i.e. the species named *Chinchilla velligera* by Prell in 1934), partly upon the False Chinchilla (i.e. the Chinchilla Rat now referred to the genus *Abrocoma* Waterhouse), and in part " on figments of the imagination ", and (2) that Bennett's use in 1829 of the trivial name *laniger* Molina (in the feminine form *lanigera*) constituted a perfectly valid selection under Article 31 of the true Chinchilla of Chile (one of the originally included species) to be the species to which the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782, should adhere. Dr. Hershkovitz therefore recommended that the Commission should give a ruling in this sense.

Continuing, the Acting President said that it was evident that the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829, was monotypical from Bennett's standpoint and therefore that under the *Règles* the type species was *Mus laniger* Molina, 1782, the only nominal species referred to the genus by Bennett. The first question which must be cleared up before a decision could be taken on the present case was a taxonomic one, namely whether, in the original description of *Mus laniger* Molina, 1782, that name was (1) applied to the true Chinchilla of Chile, or (2) was the name of a composite species which included the foregoing species, or (3) applied neither in whole nor in part to that species. On this subject the evidence submitted was conflicting: Prell (1934) considered that this name applied not to the true Chinchilla (of Chile) but to the Chinchilla Rat (at that time known as *Abrocoma cuvieri* Waterhouse, 1837); the late Dr. Osgood did not discuss in his application to the Commission (1947) the species to which he considered that the trivial name *laniger* Molina correctly applied, but stated definitely that it did not apply to the true Chinchilla of Chile; in an earlier paper (1936) he had however (a) rejected the name *laniger* Molina not only for the true Chinchilla of Chile but also for the Chilean Chinchilla Rat (which he had called *Abrocoma bennetti* Waterhouse, 1837); Hershkovitz (*in litt.*, 24th March, 1948) had considered that *Mus laniger* Molina, when first published, had been the name of a composite species, which included, *inter alia*, both the true Chinchilla (of Chile) and the False Chinchilla (= the Chinchilla Rat) but that Bennett, acting under Article 31, had in 1829 definitely restricted this name to the true Chinchilla. Thus, according to the point of view of the individual systematist, the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782, was either (1) a *nomen dubium* (Osgood) (2) the oldest available name for the False Chinchilla (Chinchilla Rat) (Prell) or (3) the oldest available name for the true Chinchilla of Chile (Hershkovitz). If Prell's contention had secured general support from mammalogists (which it had not), the present case would have been simple, for the name *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829, would have been the name of a genus based upon a misidentified type species, and, in view of the " long-continued confusion of technical and vernacular names " (Osgood, 1947) which would follow the substitution of the Chinchilla Rat (*Abrocoma* sp.) for the true Chinchilla of Chile as the type species of *Chinchilla* Bennett, there would have been a strong case for the Commission (acting on the principle laid down in *Opinion* 168) using their plenary powers to designate as the type species of that genus the true Chinchilla of Chile under whatever was its oldest available name. But Prell's identification of *Mus laniger* Molina was contested, though from different points of view, both by Osgood and by Hershkovitz. In these circumstances, it appeared to him (the Acting President) that it would be impossible for the Commission to deal with the question of the type species of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829, until the identity of the species to which the trivial name *laniger* Molina applied had been determined or at least until the status of that name had been settled. On this question it was desirable to enlarge the field of evidence by obtaining the views of other leading mammalogists. If the consensus of opinion favoured either the view that the name *Mus laniger* Molina was a *nomen dubium* or that it applied to the Chinchilla Rat and not to the true Chinchilla of Chile, the way would be cleared for the Commission to suppress that name under their plenary powers to prevent the confusion which would arise, in the first case if the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett had to be rejected as a *nomen dubium* (as would happen if its type species were to be unrecognisable), and in the second case, if under the *Règles* it were found to be necessary to substitute the Chinchilla Rat for the true Chinchilla of Chile as the type species of *Chinchilla* Bennett. If however the consensus of opinion favoured the view (on taxonomic grounds) that the nominal species *Mus laniger* Molina, 1782, had originally been a composite species comprising (*inter alia*) both the true Chinchilla of Chile and also the Chinchilla Rat, it would be necessary for the Commission to determine by what author and where one of the originally included species had been selected under Article 31 to be the species to which the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782, should adhere. On this question it appeared to him (the Acting President) that action such as that by Bennett (1829) in applying the name of a previously published composite nominal species to a single species without indicating in any way that he was conscious of so doing could not at any time have been correctly treated as the selection by that author of the species in question (the true Chinchilla of Chile) to be the species to which the previously published trivial name (*laniger* Molina) should adhere, for under Article 31 such a process of selection was governed by the provisions, *mutatis mutandis*, of Rule (g) in Article 30, which laid it down that the expression " select the type " was to be " rigidly construed " and that " the mention of a species as an illustration or example " did not constitute a selection of a type. However this might be, the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin to clarify the meaning of Article 31 certainly ruled out the argument that Bennett had effectively selected the true Chinchilla of Chile to be

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

the species to which the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782 (if originally published as the trivial name of a composite nominal species) should adhere. If therefore specialists were in general to agree that, as originally published, *Mus laniger* Molina was a composite species, it would be necessary to re-examine the literature, in order to determine where, and in what manner, the provisions of Article 31 had been effectively applied to that name.

THE COMMISSION :—

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 38)

(1) agreed that, in view of the provision initially laid down in *Opinions* 65 and 168 and now—as agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin—to be incorporated in the *Règles* (that the author of a genus is to be assumed to have correctly identified the species referred by him thereto), the type species of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829, was *Mus laniger* Molina, 1782, the genus being monotypical from Bennett's standpoint and the above being the only species specifically cited ;

(2) took note that the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782 (as published in the binominal combination *Mus laniger*) was variously regarded by specialists (a) as a *nomen dubium*, (b) as the oldest available name for the true Chinchilla of Chile (i.e. the species named or renamed *Chinchilla velligera* by Prell in 1934), and (c) as the oldest available name for the False Chinchilla or Chinchilla Rat (i.e. the species commonly referred to the genus *Abrocoma* Waterhouse, 1837, to which the trivial names *bennetti* and *cuvieri* had been given by that author at the time when he first published the generic name *Abrocoma*) ;

(3) agreed that, before a decision could be taken on the question whether the use of their plenary powers was necessary to prevent the confusion in technical and vernacular names which would arise if, under the *Règles*, it were to be necessary to substitute the Chinchilla Rat (*bennetti* Waterhouse, 1837) for the true Chinchilla of Chile (*velligera* Prell) as the type species of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829, it was essential to determine the identity of the species to which the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782 (as published in the binominal combination *Mus laniger*) should be applied ;

(4) in view of (3) above, invited the Secretary to the Commission to confer with interested specialists

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 11)

with a view to ascertaining as rapidly as possible (a) their views on the alternative interpretations of the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782, specified in (2) above, and (b) in so far as specialists regarded the above name as having been applied to a composite species at the time when it was published, their views on the question of the occasion (if any) on which a later author, acting under Article 31 of the *Règles*, had definitely selected one of the originally included species to be the species to which the foregoing trivial name should adhere ;

(5) agreed to defer further consideration of the application in regard to the identity of the type species of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1729, submitted by the late Dr. Wilfred H. Osgood until the information asked for in (4) above was available

" Aturoidea ", a term applied by Vredenberg (1925) to a " section " of the genus " Nautilus " Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Nautiloidea) : declared to be of sub-generic status as from date of being so published

9. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)139) submitted by Dr. Otto Haas (at that time of the British Museum (Natural History), London) asking for a ruling on the question whether the term *Aturoidea* introduced by Vredenberg (1925) as the name for a " section " of the genus *Nautilus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Nautiloidea) was to be accepted as of subgeneric status as from the date of being so published (Haas, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 243–244). It was explained in the application that two years after the publication by Vredenberg of the term *Aturoidea* (i.e. in 1927) Spath had published the sub-generic name *Paraturia* for the same group. If Vredenberg's *Aturoidea* could properly be accepted as from 1925, the date when it was published, the name would take precedence over *Paraturia* Spath, 1927. If, on the other hand, *Aturoidea* could not properly be accepted as having been published in 1925 as a subgeneric name, the name *Paraturia* Spath, 1927, instead of being a synonym, would be a valid name. Cotter (1928), when editing Vredenberg's manuscripts in preparation for the publication of a posthumous volume, had first rejected the claims of *Aturoidea* to be a subgeneric name as from Vredenberg, 1925, and had therefore accepted as available the name *Paraturia* Spath, 1927, but later (in the same volume) he had changed his mind, accepting *Aturoidea* Vredenberg as an available name as from 1925 and accordingly sinking *Paraturia* Spath, 1927, as a synonym. This latter view was accepted by Spath himself (1929), and by Schenk (1931) and Miller and Thompson

(1933, 1935). Dr. Haas, on the other hand, was doubtful whether Vredenberg had in fact intended to establish a new subgenus, partly because he applied the term " section " to the word *Aturoidea* and partly because of the form of the termination (*-oidea*) selected by that author in constructing the term *Aturoidea*.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present application had been considered by the members of the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America, but no vote thereon had been taken by the Committee as a whole. From the individual comments so obtained it appeared that the general feeling of the Committee was in favour of the International Commission being asked to give a clear-cut ruling regarding the status to be accorded to names proposed for sections. On the general question of the desirability of accepting such names (and in particular whether the name *Aturoidea* Vredenberg, 1925, should be accepted), opinion in the Committee seemed to be divided : two members (Wells, Cooper) favouring the rejection of section names, and four (Reeside, Simpson, Palmer and Frizzell) supporting their recognition, the remaining five members taking no definite stand beyond supporting the request for a ruling from the International Commission.

IT WAS STATED in the discussion of this case that the present was no mere isolated example ; many similar cases were to be found in the literature of different parts of the Animal Kingdom ; in some instances the original author had applied the expression " section " (or a corresponding expression) in connection with terms used in this way, but in many other instances there was nothing to show the precise intention of the author in introducing the expression concerned. In these circumstances it would be impossible to devise a rule, even were such desirable, to determine when in such cases a term so introduced was to be accepted as having status as a subgeneric name as from the date of being so published and when it should not. The only safe course, in this as in other similar cases, was for the *Règles* to rely not upon the alleged intentions of an author but upon the objective evidence provided by what he actually published. If an author published for a group of species within a single genus a term consisting of a Latin or latinised word in the nominative singular or, if the word so published was not a classical Latin word, a word having a termination consistent with its being regarded as a word in the nominative singular, that word should be accepted as having been published by the author concerned as a subgeneric name. It was desirable that this should be made clear in the *Règles;* the instance submitted by Dr. Haas might usefully be cited as an example of the proposition so laid down.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where an author applied to a group or to each of a number of groups of species within a given genus a term consisting of a Latin or latinised word in the nominative singular or, if the word selected was not a classical Latin word, a word having a termination consistent with its being in the nominative singular, the word so published was to be treated as having status as a subgeneric name as from the date of such publication irrespective of whether the author in using such a term expressly qualified it by the expression " section " or its equivalent, and that the following example should be inserted at the close of the foregoing provision : the term *Aturoidea* published by Vredenberg (1925) as the name of a section of the genus *Nautilus* Linnaeus, 1758, being a word having a termination consistent with its being a latinised noun in the nominative singular, ranks as a subgeneric name as from Vredenberg, 1925, and accordingly has priority over *Paraturia* Spath, 1927, expressly published as the name of a subgenus containing the same group of species.

" Bradycellus " Erichson, 1837 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) (proposed use of the plenary powers for) consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained

10. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) a paper by Mr. H. E. Andrewes (Leicester, England) (file Z.N.(S.)158) expressing the opinion that confusion would arise if *Harpalus placidus* Gyll., 1827, were to be accepted as the type species of the genus *Bradycellus* Erichson, 1837 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) in accordance with the selection by Westwood (1838) and Hope (1838), and expressing the hope that, in order to avoid this confusion, the International Commission would set aside the foregoing type selections under their plenary powers and designate *Carabus collaris* Paykull, 1798, to be type species of this genus (Andrewes, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 245) ;

(b) a paper by Sir Guy Marshall (formerly Director of the Imperial Institute of Entomology, London), Mr. H. E. Andrewes (Leicester, England), Professor W. A. F. Balfour-Browne (formerly Professor of Entomology, Imperial College of Science and Technology, London), Dr. K. G. Blair (British Museum (Natural History), London) and Mr. M. Cameron (British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring) supporting the conclusions reached by Mr. Andrewes (see (a) above) and endorsing his recommendation that the plenary powers should be used in the manner proposed (Marshall, Andrewes, Balfour-Browne, Blair & Cameron, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 246–247).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said the present was the first of a series of recommendations relating to generic names in the family CARABIDAE prepared by the Coleoptera Sub-Committee of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature of the Royal Entomological Society of London, by which body these recommendations had been submitted to the Commission. The only objection which had been lodged in the present case, which had been received from Dr. Richard Blackwelder (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) was concerned not so much with the substance of the application as with its form, Dr. Blackwelder taking the view that the data submitted with the application were not sufficient to justify the use of the plenary powers.

IN DISCUSSION the view was expressed that it would be advisable in the present case to ask the Royal Entomological Society of London to furnish a supplementary statement dealing especially with the question of the extent to which confusion might be expected if the plenary powers were not used in this case.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the information in their possession on the question whether the strict application of the *Règles* in the case of the name *Bradycellus* Erichson, 1837 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) would lead to greater confusion than uniformity was not sufficient to show whether in this case the plenary powers should be used in the manner proposed ;

(2) to notify the foregoing conclusion to the Royal Entomological Society of London and at the same time to ask for a supplementary statement setting out the nature and extent of the confusion apprehended by the Society if the *Règles* were strictly applied in the case referred to in (1) above ;

(3) to defer taking a decision on the foregoing case until the supplementary statement, asked for in (2) above, was available.

" Carabus " Linnaeus, 1758 Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) : designation of type species of, under the plenary powers

11. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) an application (file Z.N.(S.)158) submitted by Mr. H. E. Andrewes (Leicester, England) that the plenary powers should be used to set aside the action of Curtis (1833) and Westwood (1838) in selecting *Carabus violaceus* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Carabus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera), and that in place of that species *Carabus granulatus* Linnaeus, 1758, should be designated as the type species of the foregoing genus (Andrewes, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 247) ;

(b) a paper by Sir Guy Marshall (formerly Director of the Imperial Institute of Entomology, London), Mr. H. E. Andrewes (Leicester, England), Professor W. A. F. Balfour-Browne (formerly Professor of Entomology, Imperial College of Science and Technology, London), Dr. K. G. Blair (British Museum (Natural History), London) and Mr. M. Cameron (British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring), supporting and elaborating the proposal submitted by Mr. H. E. Andrewes (see (a) above) (Marshall, Andrewes, Balfour-Browne, Blair & Cameron, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 248).

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion 10)

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 13)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the only objection which had been lodged against the action proposed in this case was similar to, and came from the same source as, the objection which the Commission had just considered in the case of the name *Bradycellus* Erichson, 1837. The Commission would no doubt give due weight to the objection so advanced. In his (the Acting President's) opinion, it was necessary, however, to bear in mind that the genus *Carabus* Linnaeus was one of the best known of all the genera in the Class Insecta ; in consequence this generic name fell in the class of names, to applications regarding which (as had been agreed at the meeting noted in the margin) the Commission should give special consideration with a view to securing, *inter alia*, that long-forgotten or long-ignored type selections should not be permitted to introduce instability by disturbing current nomenclatorial practice. In this case, therefore, his recommendation was that the Commission should use their plenary powers to grant the desired relief.

GENERAL AGREEMENT was expressed with the views expressed by the Acting President.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

  (a) to set aside all selections of the type species of the genus *Carabus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) made previous to the present decision ;

  (b) to designate *Carabus granulatus* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the foregoing genus ;

(2) to place the generic name *Carabus* Linnaeus, 1758, with the type species specified in (1)(b) above, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the trivial name *granulatus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Carabus granulatus*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

PURCHASED
26 JUN 1958

" Harpalus " Latreille [1802–1803] and " Ophonus " Stephens, 1827, " Lebia " Latreille [1802–1803], " Tachys " Stephens, 1828, and " Trechus " Schellenberg, 1806 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) (application for the use of the plenary powers for) : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained

12. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the undermentioned applications concerning generic names in the Order Coleoptera (Class Insecta) (file Z.N.(S.)158) submitted (i) by Mr. H. E. Andrewes (Leicester, England) and (ii) by Sir Guy Marshall (formerly Director of the Imperial Institute of Entomology, London), Mr. H. E. Andrewes (Leicester, England), Professor W. A. F. Balfour-Browne (formerly Professor of Entomology, Imperial College of Science and Technology, London), Dr. K. G. Blair (British Museum (Natural History), London) and Mr. M. Cameron (British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring) requesting the Commission to use its plenary powers :—

(a) (i) to set aside the selection by Latreille (1810) of *Carabus ruficornis* Fabricius, 1775, as the type species of *Harpalus* Latreille [1802–1803], and to designate in the place of that species *Carabus aeneus* Fabricius, 1775, to be the type species of the foregoing genus, and (ii) to set aside the selection by Curtis (1827) of *Carabus germanus* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Ophonus* Stephens, 1827, and to designate in the place of that species *Carabus obscurus* Fabricius, 1792, to be the type species of *Ophonus* Stephens, 1827 (Andrewes, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 249 ; Marshall, Andrewes, Balfour-Browne, Blair & Cameron, 1947, *ibid.*, **1** : 250–251) ;

THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, have great pleasure in expressing their grateful thanks to the UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION (U.N.E.S.C.O.) for the financial assistance afforded towards the cost of producing the present volume.

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Notice to subscribers regarding the arrangements made for the completion of volume 1 and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5

The following arrangements have been made for completing volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5 :—

Volume 1 : A concluding Part (Part 12), containing, *inter alia*, the Title Page, Table of Contents, and alphabetical subject index, will be published shortly.

Volume 2 : This volume, like Volume 1, will be devoted to the publication of applications in regard to nomenclatorial problems submitted by specialists to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. Publication will commence at an early date.

Volume 3 : This volume, which is now complete in 9 Parts, is devoted to the publication of the memoranda, reports and other documents considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at their meetings held in Paris in July 1948.

Volume 4 : This volume is devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July* 1948. Twenty-one Parts have been published and this volume is now complete except for the index which will be published in a concluding Part.

Volume 5 : At the request of the Bureau of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, this volume will be devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July* 1948, together with the Reports submitted to the Congress by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature.

INQUIRIES

All inquiries regarding publications should be addressed to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, and all inquiries regarding the scientific work of the Commission to the Secretary to the Commission at the following addresses :—

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7, England.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : Secretariat of the Commission, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.

Printed in Great Britain by Metchim and Son, Ltd., Westminster London

VOLUME 4. Parts 16/18
pp. 447—542.

9th June, 1950

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

PURCHASED
26 JUN 1950

BRITISH MUSEUM NATURAL HISTORY

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

CONTENTS :

The Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July 1948 : Page
Conclusions of Fourteenth Meeting (*second instalment*) 447—542

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth
International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948,

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the
International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
at the Publications Office of the Trust
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1950

Price One pound, eight shillings.

(*All rights reserved*)

(*For the rule under which a trivial name such as "4-maculatus" is to be transliterated as "quattuormaculatus," see Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 10)

(b) to set aside the selection by Latreille (1810) of "*Carabus* 4-*maculatus* Fab." (=*Carabus quattuormaculatus* Linnaeus, 1758) as the type species of the genus *Lebia* Latreille [1802–1803], and to designate in the place of that species *Buprestis marginatus* Fourcroy, 1785, to be the type species of the foregoing genus (Andrewes, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 251–252 ; Marshall, Andrewes, Balfour-Browne, Blair & Cameron, 1947, *ibid.*, **1** : 252–253) ;

(c) to set aside the selection by Westwood (1838) of *Bembidium obtusum* Sturm, 1825, as the type species of the genus *Tachys* Stephens, 1828, and to designate in the place of that species *Tachys scutellaris* Stephens, 1828, to be the type species of the foregoing genus (Andrewes, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 253 ; Marshall, Andrewes, Balfour-Browne, Blair & Cameron, 1947, *ibid.*, **1** : 254) ;

(d) to set aside the selection by Latreille (1810) of "*Trechus meridianus* Clairv." (=*Carabus meridianus* Linnaeus, 1761) as the type species of the genus *Trechus* Schellenberg, 1806, and to designate in the place of that species *Carabus quadristriatus* Schrank, 1781, to be the type species of the foregoing genus (Andrewes, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 255 ; Marshall, Andrewes, Balfour-Browne, Blair & Cameron, 1947, *ibid.*, **1** : 256.)

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion* 10)

In discussion the view was expressed that it was desirable to seek additional information in regard to these applications in the same way as had been agreed upon in the case of the name *Bradycellus* Erichson, 1837, which the Commission had considered a few minutes earlier.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the information in their possession on the question whether the strict application of the *Règles* in the case of the undermentioned names of genera in the Order Coleoptera (Class Insecta) would lead to greater confusion than uniformity was not sufficient to show whether in these cases the plenary powers should be used in the manner proposed :—

Harpalus Latreille [1802–1803] and *Ophonus* Stephens, 1827
Lebia Latreille [1802–1803]
Tachys Stephens, 1828
Trechus Schellenberg, 1806 ;

(2) to notify the foregoing conclusion to the Royal Entomological Society of London (through which the foregoing applications had been submitted to the Commission) and at the same time to ask for supplementary statements setting out, for each of the names concerned, the nature and extent of the confusion apprehended by the Society if the *Règles* were strictly applied in relation to the names specified in (1) above;

(3) to defer taking decisions on the applications referred to above, until the supplementary statements, asked for in (2) above, were severally available.

Part 11 of Volume 1 of the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature": applications published in, to be considered in turn

13. THE COMMISSION had before them Part 11 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* containing 21 papers relating to 18 individual problems of nomenclature.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note that two of the papers published in Part 11 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (i.e. the papers relating to the generic name *Corixa* Geoffroy, 1762) had already been considered at the meeting noted in the margin when the Commission had examined the question of the availability of generic names published in Geoffroy, 1762, *Hist. abrég. Ins. Env. Paris;*

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusion* 15)

(2) agreed to examine, in turn, each of the remaining 17 applications, 19 papers relating to which had been published in the foregoing Part of the *Bulletin.*

"Dinornis novaezealandiae" Owen, 1842 (Class Aves, Order Dinorniformes): determination of lectotype of, under Article 31

14. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)136) submitted by Dr. Gilbert Archey (Auckland Institute and Museum, New Zealand) and Dr. R. S. Allan (Canterbury University College, Christchurch, New Zealand) asking for a ruling on the identity of the type species of the nominal species *Dinornis novaezealandiae* Owen, 1843 (Class Aves, Order Dinornithiformes), having regard to the fact that Owen did not designate a type specimen for this species and that of his three syntypes, one, the tarso-metatarsus (m3), had later (1844) been designated by Owen as the holotype of *Dinornis struthoides* while another, the tibio-tarsus (t2), had at the same time been designated as the holotype of another new nominal species, *Dinornis ingens* Owen (Archey & Allan, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 257). The applicants had made it clear (*in litt.*) that in their view two species only were involved and had added that no confusion would arise either if the Commission were to rule that the lectotype of *Dinornis novaezealandiae* Owen, 1843, was the specimen which later had been designated as the holotype of *Dinornis ingens* Owen, 1844, or if they were to rule that it was the specimen (the femur (f12)), which alone of the original syntypes of *Dinornis novaezealandiae* Owen, 1843, had not later been designated as the holotype of another nominal species. The applicants agreed that if the Commission were to take the latter view the trivial name *novaezealandiae* Owen, 1843, would replace the trivial name *struthoides* Owen, 1844, since, in their view, the femus (which would then be the lectotype of *novaezealandiae* Owen) was referable to the same species as the tarso-metarsus, which was the holotype of *struthoides* Owen, 1844.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that while, prior to the opening of the present Session, it might have been difficult to answer the question raised by this case, all difficulty had been removed by the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin that Article 31 (applying to type specimens of species the provisions of Article 30 in regard to the type species of genera) should be clarified and amplified. That decision had made it clear, *inter alia*, that the provisions of *Opinion* 62 (now, as agreed at the meeting noted in the margin, to be incorporated in the *Règles*) (that an author, acting under Rule (g) in Article 30, could, if he so desired, select as the type species of a genus a species which was already the type species of another genus) applied also in the field of type specimens, that is to say, an author was free, should he so desire, to select as the lectotype of one nominal species a specimen which was already the holotype or lectotype of another. It was clear therefore that the first selection of a lectotype for the species originally described as *Dinornis novaezealandiae* Owen, 1843 (namely the selection by Lydekker (1891) from the three syntypes of that species the tibio-tarsus (t2) to be the lectotype of the above species) was valid under the *Règles*. In consequence, the trivial name *ingens* Owen, 1844, was an objective synonym of *novaezealandiae* Owen, 1843, the same specimen being the lectotype of the species bearing the older of these names and the holotype of the species bearing the later published of the names in question.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that Lydekker (1891) did not act in contravention of Article 31 when he selected from among the three syntypes of the nominal species *Dinornis*

(For the decisions that Article 15 should be amended to require that a compound trivial name should be written as a single word and that names published in contravention of that Article should automatically be corrected, see Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion 9, and 4th Meetng, Conclusion 5, respectively)

novaezealandiae Owen, 1843, the tibio-tarsus (t2) to be the lectotype of that species and consequently the foregoing lectotype selection, being the first to have been made under Article 31, was valid under the *Règles;*

(2) that, in view of (1) above, the trivial name *ingens* Owen, 1844 (published in the binominal combination *Dinornis ingens*), being the trivial name of a nominal species of which the specimen referred to in (1) above was the holotype, was an objective synonym of the older trivial name *novaezealandiae* Owen, 1843 ;

(3) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" :—

novaezealandiae Owen, 1843 (as published in the binominal combination *Dinornis novaezealandiae*), determined in the manner specified in (1) above ;

struthoides Owen, 1844 (as published in the binominal combination *Dinornis struthoides*) ;

(4) to place the trivial name *ingens* Owen, 1844 (as published in the binominal combination *Dinornis ingens*), on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" ;

(5) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (4) above.

Martin (W.), 1793 "Fig. Descr. Petrif. Derbyshire", and 1809, "Petrificata Derbiensia", declared not available for nomenclatorial purposes

15. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)147), submitted by Dr. J. Brookes Knight (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) asking for a ruling on the question of the availability of names first published in two works by W. Martin : (1) that author's *Figures and Descriptions of Petrifactions collected in Derbyshire*, published in 1793 ; (2) his *Petrificata Derbiensia; or Figures and descriptions of Petrifactions collected in Derbyshire*, published in 1809 (Knight, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 260). By way of illustration of the type of nomenclature employed by Martin in these works Dr. Knight had submitted the following examples : (1) "CONCHYLIOLITHUS (catillus) HELICIS" which appeared in Martin's *Fig. Descr. Petrif. Derbyshire* of 1793, as regards which Dr. Knight had stated that it was clear from the discussion given (in English) that Martin did not regard *Conchyliolithus* as a name, looking upon it merely as a designation for fossil shells, for in the above case he used the expression " a fossil shell, of the genus *Helix* " in connection with the species to which he had applied the trinominal designation quoted above ; (2) " Conchyliolithus Anomites productus " and " Conchyliolithus Nautilites Ammonites listeri," which appeared in Martin's *Petrificata Derbiensia* of 1809.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that it was impossible to argue that the expressions quoted by Dr. Knight were examples of binominal nomenclature and therefore to claim that in the two works in question Martin had " appliqué les principes de la nomenclature binominale " as was now required by Proviso (b) to Article 25. There was, therefore, in his view, no doubt but that both the foregoing works by Martin should be rejected for nomenclatorial purposes, the new " names " published therein not complying with the requirements of Proviso (b) to Article 25. According to the information submitted by Dr. Knight, a decision in the foregoing sense would do no more than confirm the existing practice of specialists, so far as Martin's so-called " generic names " were concerned, these having been " universally ignored." Dr. Knight had added, however, that later authors had almost universally adopted the so-called " trivial names " employed by Martin in the later of the two works in question, namely the *Petrificata Derbiensia* of 1809. It was not clear whether the rejection of the *Petrificata Derbiensia* of 1809 as unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes would give rise to confusion in the field of trivial names (as well as preventing such confusion in the field of generic names), for where a work had to be rejected in this way, it was commonly found that the next author to use one of the trivial names so rejected (who in such circumstances became for nomenclatorial purposes the author of the name) had used the name in the same sense as the author whose use of the name had been rejected. Normally, in such circumstances the name continued to be the name for the species to which it had been originally applied, although now attributed to a later author and ranking for purposes of priority from a later date. Only when the name in its new priority was antedated by some other name published in the meantime by some other author or when, through the action of another author, the name had become a homonym, would a name, when so republished by a later author, cease to be the available name for the species in question. It was to be hoped that examination of the literature would show that the majority of the trivial names in question were still the oldest available names for the species to which they had been applied by

Martin, even if they had now to be attributed to different authors and to later dates. In so far as this was not the case, it would still be open to specialists to apply to the Commission for the validation of any given trivial name as from its use by Martin in 1809, if they were satisfied that otherwise confusion would ensue. The Acting President added that the present case had been advertised as a case in which it might be desired to use the plenary powers of the Commission, but, for the reasons which he had explained, there was, in his opinion, no reason for the adoption of such a course.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that in the undermentioned works Martin (W.) did not apply the " principes de la nomenclature binominale " as required by Proviso (b) to Article 25 and that therefore no name, whether an apparent generic name or an apparent trivial name, published in either of these works possessed any availability under the *Règles* as from the date of being so published :—

  (a) Martin, 1793, *Figures and Descriptions of Petrifactions collected in Derbyshire;*
  (b) Martin, 1809, *Petrificata Derbiensia: or Figures and Descriptions of Petrifactions collected in Derbyshire;*

(2) to give sympathetic consideration to any application which might be submitted by interested specialists for the validation as from Martin, 1809, of any trivial name first published by that author in his *Petrificata derbiensia* where that name was in general use for a common species and it could be shown that under (1) above it would be necessary to change the name of that species and that such change would lead to confusion in nomenclature ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

Twelve generic names in the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta) published in 1807 by Fabricius and Illiger in different senses : suppression under the plenary powers of the names so published by Illiger

16. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)148) submitted by Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom), in regard to the relative priority to be assigned to certain generic names in the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta) which had been published in 1807 independently by Fabricius and Illiger respectively, by whom they had been applied in very different senses (Hemming, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 261–269).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present application, which had been submitted by himself as a specialist in the Order Lepidoptera, was designed solely to remove doubts regarding the priority to be assigned to 12 generic names which were known to have been published in different senses in the same year (1807) but of which the relative dates of publication were unknown and would probably always remain so. Each of the names in question had been published by Fabricius in the well-known paper (in volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin fur Insektenkunde*) in which he had broken ground as the first author to attempt a substantial generic classification of the Sub-Order Rhopalocera. With one exception (*Thymele*), each of these names, as published by Fabricius, was today in universal use, nine for genera of the Sub-Order Rhopalocera and two for genera of the Sub-Order Heterocera (for groups which Fabricius had mistakenly considered to be butterflies). On 19th December, 1807, the same names had been published anonymously by Illiger in a review of the first 34 plates of Jacob Hübner's *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge*. As published by Illiger, these generic names applied to species entirely different from those assigned to the genera in question by Fabricius, although Illiger, in publishing these names, claimed to be applying the Fabrician nomenclature. In a number of cases (as he had shown in his application) the greatest possible confusion would arise if it were necessary to use these names in the sense employed by Illiger instead of in that employed by Fabricius. He accordingly asked the Commission to remove the cause of confusion which would arise if it were necessary to use these Fabrician names as published by Illiger by suppressing them for nomenclatorial purposes. The use of the plenary powers in this case was necessary, not because the strict application of the *Règles* would lead to confusion, but because of the impossibility of applying the *Règles* unless the plenary powers were used for the purpose of removing doubt as to the manner in which the *Règles* should be applied. Personally, he had always taken the view that, in the form in which the plenary powers had been granted in 1913, those powers could properly be used for removing confusion arising from doubts as to the manner in which the *Règles* should be applied as well as for removing confusion arising from the strict application of the *Règles*, but, as the Commission would recall, he had thought it desirable to seek a clarification of the scope of the plenary powers in this regard and had accordingly raised this question in Point (82) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17. In view of the decision taken by the Commission, when considering that

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 14)

paper at the meeting noted in the margin, any doubt as to the scope of the plenary powers in this matter had now been removed. No objection of any kind had been brought forward against the present proposal and he felt sure that all lepidopterists would welcome the action proposed. The Acting President added that, in preparing the present application, he had followed strictly the interpretation of the expression " indication " given by the Commission in *Opinion* 1 and had accordingly rejected as unavailable four names which, under the liberalisation of this aspect of Article 25 that had been agreed upon during the present Session were now available names. In the circumstances he asked that the decision now to be taken should cover not only the eight generic names specified in paragraph 21(ii) of the application submitted to the Commission, but also to the four names (*Brassolis*, *Euploea*, *Mechanitis*, *Thymele*) which (as already explained) he had previously rejected (paragraph 8) as invalid, but which were now available names. Turning to the question of the addition to the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " of the corresponding names as published by Fabricius in 1807, the Acting President asked that of these names the following seven should now be placed on the foregoing " Official List " :—*Apatura; Brassolis; Castnia; Emesis; Mechanitis; Neptis; Urania.* Four of the remaining Fabrician names (*Euploea*, *Helicopis*, *Nymphidium*, *Pontia*) had already been placed on the " Official List " before the bibliographical problem which had given rise to the present application had been discovered. The Acting President recommended that the position of these names on the " Official List " should be confirmed. The twelfth of the Fabrician generic names in question (*Thymele* Fabricius, 1807) was invalid, having as its type species the same species (*Papilio tages* Linnaeus, 1758) as the earlier genus *Erynnis* Schrank, 1801, and should therefore now be placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology." The Acting President then pointed out that the trivial names of the type species of the four genera, the position of the names of which on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " should, he had recommended, now be confirmed, were all available names and, under the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin, would therefore now be placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology." Of the five names of genera belonging to the Sub-Order Rhopalocera which he had recommended should be added to the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology," three (*Apatura*, *Brassolis*, *Mechanitis*) possessed as their type species nominal species, the names of which were the oldest available names for the

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 42)

species concerned; he recommended therefore that the trivial names of these species should be added to the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names." In the case of the genus *Apatura* Fabricius, there was a doubt, as between two closely allied and certainly congeneric species, as to the species to which the trivial name of the type species was applicable, but, as proposals for the clarification of this doubt would be brought before the Commission later during the present meeting, there was no reason why the trivial name in question (*iris* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binominal combination *Papilio iris*) should not now be placed on the "Official List." There were slight complications in the case of the trivial names of the nominal species which were the type species of the two remaining genera: (1) The type species of *Neptis* Fabricius, 1807, had for its trivial name *aceris* Esper [1783] (published in the binominal combination *Papilio aceris*); this name was the oldest available name for the European insect so named, but that insect was commonly regarded as being a subspecies of the Asiatic species originally named *Papilio hylas* by Linnaeus in 1758; (2) The nominal species which was the type species of *Emesis* Fabricius was *Papilio ovidius* Fabricius, 1793, which was regarded by specialists as a synonym of the nominal species *Papilio cereus* Linnaeus, 1767. In accordance with the principle agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin at the time when the "Official List of Trivial Names" had been established, it would be desirable in the first of these cases to place on the "List" the trivial name both of the nominal species which was the type species of the genus concerned (*Neptis* Fabricius) and also the trivial name of the species of which it was regarded as a subspecies, while in the second case the trivial name of the nominal species which was the type species of the genus in question (*Emesis* Fabricius) should not be placed on the "List" but the trivial name of the nominal species (*cereus* Linnaeus) of which the type species (*ovidius* Fabricius) was regarded as a synonym should be so placed. The Acting President added that, while he had obtained the support of Mr. N. D. Riley and Mr. W. H. T. Tams (British Museum (Natural History)) for the proposed addition to the "Official List of Generic Names" of the two names of genera of the Sub-Order Heterocera (*Castnia*, *Urania*), he had not at that time considered the question of the oldest available names for the type species of those genera, there having been no need to do so, the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names" not then having been in existence. In the case of the type species of the first of these genera, there was, he knew, a difficult underlying problem of the relative precedence to be accorded to certain books published on unknown

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion* 39)

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 42)

dates in the same year (1775), on which a decision would first have to be taken by the Commission as a question of principle. The books concerned were: (1) volume 1 of Cramer's *Uitlandsche Kapellen* (in which *Papilio icarus*, the name of the type species of the genus *Castnia* Fabricius, was first published); (2) a paper entitled *Anmerkungen zu den Hufnagelischen Tabellen der Schmetterlinge* by von Rottemburg published in volume 6 of the journal *Naturforscher*; (3) the anonymous work *Ankundigung eines systematischen Werkes von den Schmetterlingen der Wiener Gegend* (the so-called *Wiener Verzeichniss*) by Schiffermüller & Denis; (4) the *Systema Entomoligiae* of Fabricius. In the circumstances, he proposed that the Commission should agree to place on the "Official List" whatever might ultimately be found to be the oldest available trivial names for the type species of these genera.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers, in so far as that might be necessary :—

(a) to suppress for the purposes of Articles 25 and 34 the undermentioned generic names published in the issue of 19th December, 1807, of the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung*, Halle [Jena] in an anonymous review by Illiger of the first 34 plates of Jacob Hübner's *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* to have been published :—

Apatura [Illiger], 1807.
Brassolis [Illiger], 1807.
Castnia [Illiger], 1807.
Emesis [Illiger], 1807.
Euploea [Illiger], 1807.
Helicopis [Illiger], 1807.
Mechanitis [Illiger], 1807.
Neptis [Illiger], 1807.
Nymphidium [Illiger], 1807.
Pontia [Illiger], 1807.
Thymele [Illiger], 1807.
Urania [Illiger], 1807.

(b) to render available under Articles 25 and 34 all the generic names specified above other than *Thymele*, as published by Fabricius in 1807 in Volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin fur Naturkunde ;*

(2) to place on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" the 12 generic names specified in (1) (a) above ;

(3) to place the undermentioned generic names, with the type species severally specified below, on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology":—

Name of genus (1)	*Type species of genus specified in Col.* (1) (2)
Apatura Fabricius, 1807	*Papilio iris* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Curtis, 1831).
Brassolis Fabricius, 1807	*Papilio sophorae* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Blanchard, 1840)
Castnia Fabricius, 1807	*Papilio icarus* Cramer, [1775] (type species selected by Latreille, 1810)
Emesis Fabricius, 1807	*Hesperia ovidius* Fabricius, 1793 [=*Papilio cereus* Linnaeus, 1767] (type species selected by Westwood, [1851])
Mechanitis Fabricius, 1807	*Papilio polymnia* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Scudder, 1875).
Neptis Fabricius, 1807	*Papilio aceris* Esper [1783] [=*Papilio hylas* Linnaeus, 1758, ssp.] (type species selected by Crotch, 1872).
Urania Fabricius, 1807	*Papilio leilus* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Latreille, 1810);

(4) to confirm the entries on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" relating to the undermentioned generic names, with the type species severally specified below:—

Name of genus (1)	*Type species of genus specified in Col.* (1) (2)
Euploea Fabricius, 1807	*Papilio corus* Fabricius, 1793 (type species designated under the plenary powers in *Opinion* 163)
Helicopis Fabricius, 1807	*Papilio cupido* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Scudder, 1875)

Nymphidium Fabricius, 1807	*Papilio caricae* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Crotch, 1872)
Pontia Fabricius, 1807	*Papilio daplidice* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Curtis, 1824)

(5) to place the generic name *Thymele* Fabricius, 1807 (type species, by selection by Westwood, 1840: *Papilio tages* Linnaeus, 1758) on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(6) to place on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " the undermentioned trivial names, being the trivial names of the type species of certain of the genera, the names of which had been placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " under (3) above, with the exception of the trivial name *hylas* Linnaeus, 1758, which, from the standpoint of some specialists, was the trivial name of a subspecies of the same collective species as, and had priority over, the trivial name *aceris* Esper [1780], the type species of the genus *Neptis* Fabricius, 1807 :—

aceris Esper [1783] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio aceris*) (without prejudice to the prior rights of the trivial name *hylas* Linnaeus, 1758, if that name is held to apply to a subspecies of the same collective species)

cereus Linnaeus, 1767 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio cereus*)

hylas Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio hylas*)

iris Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio iris*)

polymnia Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio polymnia*)

sophorae Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio sophorae*) ;

(7) to take note that, under the decisions adopted at the time of the establishment of the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology," the trivial names of the type species of the genera specified in (4) above, being all the oldest available names for the species severally concerned, were to be placed on the foregoing " Official List " ;

(8) to invite the Secretary to the Commission, in consultation with other specialists in the Order Lepidoptera, to submit proposals for the determination by the Commission, under the procedure agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin of the relative priority to be assigned to different names for the same species and to the same name for different species published in 1775 (a) by Cramer in volume 1 of his *Uitlandsche Kapellen* (b) by von Rottemburg in a paper entitled *Anmerkungen zu den Hufnagelischen Tabellen der Schmetterlinge* published in volume 6 of the journal *Naturforscher* (c) by Schiffermüller & Denis in the anonymous work *Ankündigung eines systematischen Werkes von den Schmetterlingen der Wiener Gegend*, and (d) by Fabricius in his *Systema Entomologiae*;

(*Previous references : Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 18; *9th Meeting, Conclusion* 23)

(9) to place on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" whichever might, in the light of the decision on (8) above, be found to be the oldest available trivial name for the type species of the genus *Castnia* Fabricius, 1807.

(10) to place on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" whichever, after consultation with specialists, was found to be the oldest available trivial name for the type species of the genus *Urania* Fabricius, 1807;

(11) to render *Opinions* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (6), and, when completed, in (9) and (10) above.

"Hygriobia" Latreille, 1804 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) : emendation of, to "Hygrobia" under Article 19

17. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)159) submitted jointly by Mr. H. E. Andrewes (Leicester, England), Professor W. A. F. Balfour-Browne (formerly Professor of Entomology, Imperial College of Science, London), Dr. K. G. Blair (British Museum (Natural History), London), Mr. M. Cameron (British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring), and Mr. C. E. Tottenham (University Museum of Zoology, Cambridge, England), asking for a ruling from the Commission that the spelling of the name *Hygriobia* Latreille, 1804 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) should be emended to *Hygrobia* (Andrewes, Balfour-Browne, Blair, Cameron and Tottenham, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 270). It was stated by the applicants that the emended spelling *Hygrobia* was in universal use and had been used by workers ever since Latreille (1817) had published the name in this form. The reversion to the original spelling of *Hygriobia* would, in the view of the applicants, cause a serious, and quite unnecessary, disturbance in existing practice and would cause greater confusion than uniformity.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, although the applicants had asked the Commission to use their plenary powers to secure the end sought in their petition, the first matter which should be considered was whether the original spelling *Hygriobia* was correct or defective and, in the latter event, whether under Article 19, it should be emended. Not until an answer had been given to these questions could the possible use of the plenary powers be appropriately considered. Only one comment had been received in regard to this case, namely a letter from Dr. Richard Blackwelder (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.), who had expressed his strong personal objection to the use of the plenary powers in this case, but had offered no observations on the prior question of the applicability or otherwise of Article 19 to the name under consideration.

IN THE DISCUSSION on this case the view was expressed that, having regard to the fact that the genus under consideration was a genus of water beetles and to the common use of compound words consisting, in part of the Greek adjective ὑγρός, meaning " wet," it was evident that the correct spelling of this generic name was " Hygrobia " and that the barbarism " Hygriobia " was due either to a " faute d'orthographe " or to a " faute d'impression." Article 19, accordingly, applied to this case, and in consequence the spelling of this name should be emended from *Hygriobia* to *Hygrobia*. In these circumstances, no question arose of the use of the plenary powers in this case.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that it was " évident " that the spelling as *Hygriobia* of the generic name *Hygriobia* Latreille, 1804 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) was due either to a " faute d'orthographe " or to a " faute d'impression " ;

(2) that, in view of (1) above the foregoing generic name was, under Article 19, to be emended to *Hygrobia;*

(3) to place the generic name *Hygrobia* Latreille, 1804 (type species, by monotypy : *Dytiscus hermanni* Fabricius, 1775) on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to place the trivial name *tardus* Herbst, 1779 (as published in the binominal combination *Dytiscus tardus*) (the oldest available name for the type species of *Hygrobia* Latreille, 1804) on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";

(5) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (4) above.

"Schwagerina" von Möller, 1877 (Class Rhizopoda, Order Foraminifera): determination of type species of

18. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)87) submitted by Professor Hubert G. Schenck (Stanford University, California, U.S.A.) asking for a ruling on the species to be accepted as the type species of the genus *Schwagerina* von Möller, 1877 (Class Rhizopoda, Order Foraminifera) (Schenck, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 271–272). Professor Schenck explained that this monotypical genus had undoubtedly been based upon a misidentified type species. The only species cited by von Möller under this genus was *Borealis princeps* Ehrenberg, 1842, but a recent examination of Ehrenberg's type material by modern critical methods had shown that the species so named by Ehrenberg differed morphologically from that on which von Möller had based the genus *Schwagerina*, belonging not only to a different species but differing generically therefrom. The species so misidentified by von Möller was later named *Schwagerina moelleri* by Rauser-Chernoussova in 1937. Thus, some 60 years elapsed before the error of identification by von Möller was detected and during that period the species which that author had misidentified as *Borealis princeps* Ehrenberg had been universally accepted as the type species of the genus *Schwagerina*. When in 1935 Dr. Carl O. Dunbar had detected this error, he had inquired of the Commission whether in the exceptional circumstances they would be prepared to entertain an application that they should use their plenary powers to designate as the type species of the genus *Schwagerina* the species which von Möller had intended to refer to, when he established that genus, in place of the species to which, through an error of identification, he did in fact then refer. Unfortunately, at that moment the Secretaryship of the Commission had been vacant, and Dr. Dunbar had been unable to obtain any reply from the Commission. Accordingly, he and Dr. Skinner had decided that they had no option but to apply to this case the interpretation of Article 30 given in the Commission's *Opinion* 65. They had therefore accepted the true *Borealis princeps* Ehrenberg as the type species of *Schwagerina* von Möller, and had established a genus (*Pseudoschwagerina* Dunbar and Skinner, 1935) for the species which von Möller had misidentified with *Borealis princeps* Ehrenberg and for its immediate allies. Since then most workers had adopted *Pseudoschwagerina* in place of *Schwagerina* in its old sense and had applied the latter name to the true *Borealis princeps* Ehrenberg. In the light of these events, Professor Schenck considered that uniformity and stability would best be secured by the Commission confirming *Borealis princeps* Ehrenberg, 1842, as the type species of the genus *Schwagerina* von Möller, 1877. Professor Schenck was supported in this view by Professor M. L. Thompson (University of Kansas, Lawrence, U.S.A.).

(Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion 23)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the Commission would, he felt sure, regret the delay which had occurred in dealing with this case, for, if it had been possible to take action promptly when this problem was first brought to notice by Dr. Carl O. Dunbar, the Commission, by using their plenary powers, could have saved the name *Schwagerina* von Möller for use in the then universally accepted sense, namely as the generic name for a widely-known guide fossil to the Lower Permian throughout the Northern Hemisphere. For the genus *Schwagerina* von Möller was clearly a genus based upon a misidentified species, and, as such, could readily have been dealt with by the Commission under *Opinion* 65 and the fuller *Opinion* (*Opinion* 168) on the same subject which they had adopted at their Lisbon Session, for at that time it was clear that the substitution as the type species of the genus *Schwagerina* von Möller of the species (*Borealis princeps* Ehrenberg) actually cited by von Möller for the species (*Schwagerina moelleri* Rauser-Chernoussova) to which he had intended to refer would certainly have led (as, in fact, it did lead) to confusion and instability in nomenclature. At the present time, however, the position was different, for the " agony " (as one leading American paleontologist had termed it) involved in the change of the type species of *Schwagerina* had been overcome and workers were in general accustomed to the new use of that generic name. Professor Schenck (who before the present practice had become crystalised, had favoured the recognition of *Schwagerina moelleri* as the type species of *Schwagerina*) now recommended that in the altered circumstances the Commission should give a ruling that the true *Borealis princeps* of Ehrenberg was to be recognised as the type species. He (the Acting President), as Secretary to the Commission, had had considerable correspondence with specialists in regard to this case, notably Professor M. L. Thompson, Dr. Carl O. Dunbar and Dr. Myra Keen, all of whom favoured the course now proposed. In addition, he had raised this question at a widely-attended meeting on nomenclature held at Ottawa at the beginning of that year during the annual meetings of the Paleontological Society of America and of the Geological Society of America. All the specialists then present had favoured the solution now proposed. In addition, this case had been considered by the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America, which (by 11 affirmative and no negative votes) had adopted a resolution supporting the action recommended by Professor Schenck. The Acting President added that such a decision would be in strict conformity with the provisions which it had been agreed (at the meeting noted in the margin) should be inserted in the *Règles* to give effect to the decisions relating to the interpretation of Article 30 given in *Opinions* 65 and 168, for, although, in general, those provisions enjoined the Commission to use their plenary powers to designate as the type species of a genus based upon a misidentified type species the species intended by the original author of the genus (as contrasted with the species actually cited by that author), there had been inserted, as the Commission would recall, a saving clause directing that the plenary powers should not be used even where a genus had clearly been established on a misidentified type species, in cases where the Commission considered that such a use of the plenary powers would lead to greater confusion than uniformity. In his (the Acting President's) view, the present was such a case, and he accordingly recommended the Commission to approve the application submitted.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 38)

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to place on record their regret at the delay which had occurred in reaching a decision on the present case, a delay which, the Commission recognised, had prejudiced the issues involved ;

(2) that, under the *Règles* the type species of the monotypical genus *Schwagerina* von Möller, 1877 (Class Rhizopoda, Order Foraminifera) was the species *Borealis princeps* Ehrenberg, 1842, the sole species cited by von Möller, when he first published the name *Schwagerina*, and not the species which that author had misidentified with the foregoing species and had before him when he established the foregoing genus, which, specialists were agreed, was the species that was at that time unnamed but had since received the name *Schwagerina moelleri* Rauser-Chernoussova, 1937

(3) that, having regard to the delay referred to in (1) above, and without prejudice to the decision which might have been taken if the case had been dealt with promptly and before therefore the situation had developed in the way that it did subsequent to 1935, it was not desirable in existing circumstances to use the plenary powers to vary the application of the *Règles* in the present case ;

(4) in view of (3) above to place the undermentioned generic names, with the type species severally specified below, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " :—

Schwagerina von Möller, 1877 (Class Rhizopoda, Order Foraminifera) (type species, by monotypy : *Borealis princeps* Ehrenberg, 1842)

Pseudoschwagerina Dunbar & Skinner, 1935 (Class Rhizopoda, Order Foraminifera) (type species, by original designation : *Schwagerina uddeni* Beede and Kniker, 1924) ;

(5) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " :—

moelleri Rauser-Chernoussova, 1937 (as published in the binominal combination *Schwagerina moelleri*)

princeps Ehrenberg, 1842 (as published in the binominal combination *Borealis princeps*)

uddeni Beede and Kniker, 1924 (as published in the binominal combination *Schwagerina uddeni*);

(6) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (2) to (5) above.

" Alydus " Fabricius, 1803 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) : validation of, under the plenary powers

19. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) a paper (file Z.N.(S.)160) by Dr. W. E. China (British Museum (Natural History), London) containing a discussion of the status of the generic name *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), the relationship of that name to the name *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796, and the relationship of the latter name to the name *Nabis* Latreille [1802–1803], and suggesting alternative methods by which the name *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803, might be conserved (China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 273–274) ;

(b) an application (file Z.N.(S.)160) submitted jointly by Mr. E. E. Green (Camberley, England) and Dr. W. E. China (British Museum (Natural History), London) for the suppression, under the plenary powers, of the generic name *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796, and the consequent validation of the name *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803 (Green & China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 275).

The present application had been submitted to the Commission by the Royal Entomological Society of London on the recommendation of their Committee on Generic Nomenclature on the basis of data submitted to that Committee by its Hemiptera Sub-Committee (in a Report published by the Society in 1943 as an annexe to the Eighth Report of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature). The paper by Dr. China (see (a) above) was an extract from the paper which that specialist had submitted to the Hemiptera Sub-Committee, while the joint paper by Mr. Green and Dr. China (see (b) above) was an extract from the Report of the Hemiptera Sub-Committee. The object of the application was to validate the name *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803 (type species : *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus, 1758), the portion of the application relating to the older name *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796, having been introduced only because certain authors (e.g. Reuter (1888), Kirkaldy (1900), Stichel (1925)) had synonymised *Coriscus dauci* Schrank, 1801 (the type species of the genus *Coriscus* Schrank) with *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus, 1758 (the type species of *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803), notwithstanding the substantial structural difference between these genera noted by Schrank in his original description of the genus *Coriscus* and of his express statement that the sole included species (then referred to by him as the " Möhrensichelwanze " and later named by him *Coriscus dauci*) was not the same as *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus. Accordingly, from the standpoint of the authors referred to above and of any other specialists who shared their taxonomic opinion regarding the identification of *Coriscus dauci* Schrank with *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus, the generic name *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803, was a synonym of *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796. Dr. China and Mr. Green did not accept the taxonomic conclusions of the foregoing authors, but, in order to put an end to any doubts on this matter, they had recommended in the Report of the Hemiptera Sub-Committee that the Commission should be asked to use their plenary powers to designate *Coriscus crassipes* Schrank, 1801, as the type species of the genus *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796. The effect of this proposal would be to make *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796, and

Nabis Latreille [1802–1803], different names for the same genus. The applicants attached importance to the maintenance of the name *Nabis* Latreille, but had been under the misapprehension that their proposal would make *Coriscus* Schrank a synonym of *Nabis* Latreille, although it was the older of the two names, in view of the fact that (in *Opinion* 104) the Commission had placed the name *Nabis* Latreille on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology."

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) explained that, when in 1944 he, as Secretary to the Commission, had prepared the present application for publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, he had drawn the attention of the applicants to the fact that the name *Nabis* Latreille had been placed on the " Official List " in the belief that under the *Règles* it was an available name, and that, as it had not been validated by the Commission under the plenary powers, it was liable to be removed from the " Official List," if it were later found to be an invalid name. As the result of this correspondence, the applicants had decided to amend their application to the form in which it was later published in the *Bulletin* (see (b) above). In its revised form the application asked for the suppression of the generic name *Coriscus* Schrank under the plenary powers. This action would at one stroke both remove any doubt as to the availability of the name *Alydus* Fabricius and safeguard fully the position of *Nabis* Latreille on the " Official List." Subsequent to this correspondence but prior to the publication of the revised application, Dr. R. I. Sailer (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) had written (1945) objecting to the original proposal on the ground that it was incomplete and, if adopted, would lead to *Nabis* Latreille being sunk as a synonym of *Coriscus* Schrank. He further expressed the view that during the last 25 years the name *Coriscus* Schrank had become well established in the literature in place of *Alydus* Fabricius and that, in view of the fact that its suppression in the manner proposed by Green and China in the Report of the Hemiptera Sub-Committee would endanger the important name *Nabis* Latreille, the proposal submitted by the Sub-Committee should be rejected. In his reply, the Acting President (as Secretary to the Commission) had informed Dr. Sailer that he shared his view that, as submitted by the Sub-Committee, the proposal regarding *Alydus* Fabricius, would, if adopted, throw *Nabis* Latreille into synonymy with *Coriscus* Schrank and that, in order to remove this objection to their proposal, Dr. China and Mr. Green had agreed upon a re-wording of their application which would safeguard fully the position of

Nabis Latreille. The application had subsequently been advertised, but the advertisement had elicited no objection to the action proposed by Dr. China.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to suppress the name *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) for the purposes of Article 25, though not for those of Article 34 ;

(b) to validate the generic name *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) ;

(2) to place the generic name *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803 (type species, selected by Curtis, 1831 : *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus, 1758) on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the name *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796, on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to confirm the entry on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " of the name *Nabis* Latreille [1802–1803] ;

(5) to place the trivial name *calcaratus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Cimex calcaratus*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(6) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (5) above.

" Salda " Fabricius, 1803 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) : designation of type species of, under the plenary powers

20. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) a paper (file Z.N.(S.)161) by Dr. W. E. China (British Museum (Natural History), London) on the status of the name *Salda* Fabricius, 1803 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) (China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 276) ;

(b) an application submitted jointly by Mr. E. E. Green (Camberley, England) and Dr. W. E. China (British Museum (Natural History), London) for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to designate *Cimex littoralis* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Salda* Fabricius, 1803 (Green & China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 276–277) ;

It was explained in the application that the universally accepted concept represented by the name *Salda* Fabricius, 1801, was based upon the belief that *Cimex littoralis* Linnaeus, 1758, had been correctly selected as the type species of this genus by Blanchard in 1848 (*in* Orbigny, *Dict. univ. Hist. nat.*, **11** ; 311). It was now realised that the Heteroptera section of the Disciples' Edition of Cuvier's *Règne Animal*, in which Blanchard had selected *Cimex grylloides* Linnaeus, 1761, as the type species of *Salda* Fabricius, was published as early as 1838 and therefore this type selection had priority over that of *Cimex littoralis* in 1848. The acceptance of *Cimex grylloïdes* Linnaeus as the type species of this genus would, however, lead to confusion, for it would involve the transfer of the genus *Salda* Fabricius to another family (now known as the LYGAEIDAE), where it would replace the well-known name *Geocoris* Fallén, 1814, while the family now known as the SALDIDAE would be left without a name.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present application, like that relating to the name *Alydus* Fabricius, which the Commission had just considered, had been submitted to the Commission by the Royal Entomological Society of London, on the recommendation of their Committee on Generic Nomenclature, acting on the advice of the Hemiptera Sub-Committee, the members of which were Dr. China and Mr. Green. The application had been advertised subsequent to publication in the *Bulletin*. The only objection received had come from Dr. Richard Blackwelder (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) who considered that the grounds advanced in the application were insufficient to justify the use by the Commission of their plenary powers.

IN DISCUSSION the view was expressed that the application submitted contained sufficient evidence as to the likelihood of confusion arising if the *Règles* were strictly applied in this case and that the application should therefore be granted.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

   (a) to set aside all selections of a type species for the genus *Salda* Fabricius, 1803 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) made prior to the present decision ;

   (b) to designate *Cimex littoralis* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the foregoing genus ;

(2) to place the generic name *Salda* Fabricius, 1803, with the type species designated in (1) (b) above, on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology";

(3) to place the trivial name *littoralis* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Cimex littoralis*) on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

Names of ten genera in the Order Hemiptera (Class Insecta) based upon misidentified type species: (1) type species of "Gastrodes" Westwood, 1840, designated under the plenary powers; (2) type species of remaining genera similarly designated conditionally

21. THE COMMISSION turned next to consider the application (file Z.N.(S.)144) submitted by Dr. W. E. China (British Museum (Natural History), London) in regard to the names of ten genera in the Order Hemiptera (Class Insecta), each of which, it was considered, was based upon a misidentified type species. The applications so submitted sought in each case the use of the plenary powers to designate as the type species of the genus concerned the species originally intended (as contrasted with the species actually cited) by the author of the generic name in question. The applications were the following:—

(a) *Aquarius* Schellenberg, 1800

Gerris paludum Schellenberg, 1800, had been selected as the type species of this genus by Kirkaldy, 1906, but it was considered that the species referred to under this name by Schellenberg was *Cimex najas* De Geer, 1773. The Commission were asked to designate the latter species as the type species of the genus (China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1**: 277–278).

(b) *Bellocoris* Hahn, 1834

Cimex maurus Linnaeus, 1758, had been selected as the type species of this genus by Westwood (1840), but it was considered that the species referred to under this name by Hahn was *Cimex austriacus* Schrank, 1776. The Commission were asked to designate the latter species as the type species of this genus (China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1**: 278–279).

(c) *Beosus* Amyot & Serville, 1843

This genus was monotypical, the sole species referred thereto by the authors of the generic name being *Lygaeus quadratus* Fabricius, 1803. It was considered that the citation of this name was due to a misidentification and that the species which Amyot and Serville intended to refer to was *Cimex maritimus* Scopoli, 1763. The Commission were asked to designate the latter species as the type species of this genus (China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 279–280).

(d) *Catoplatus* Spinola, 1837

This genus was monotypical, the sole species referred thereto by Spinola being *Acanthia costata* Fabricius, 1794. It was considered that the citation of this name was due to a misidentification and that the species which Spinola intended to refer to was *Tingis fabricii* Stål, 1868. The Commission were asked to designate the latter species as the type species of this genus (China, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 281).

(e) *Dictyonota* Curtis, 1827

Tingis eryngii Latreille, 1804, had been designated by Curtis at the time (1827) that he first published the generic name *Dictyonota*, but it was considered that the species so referred to under this name by Curtis was *Dictyonota strichnocera* Fieber, 1844. The Commission were asked to designate the latter species as the type species of this genus (China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 282).

(f) *Gastrodes* Westwood, 1840

This genus was monotypical, the sole species referred thereto by Westwood being *Cimex abietis* Linnaeus, 1758. It was considered that the citation of this name was due to a misidentification and that the species which Westwood intended to refer to was *Cimex abietum* Bergroth, 1914. The Commission were asked to designate the latter species as the type species of this genus (China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 283).

(g) *Oncotylus* Fieber, 1858

Kirkaldy (1906) selected as the type species of this genus the species which Fieber had referred thereto under the name *Capsus tanaceti* Fallén, 1807, but, in making this selection, Kirkaldy had made it clear that he realised that Fieber had misidentified Fallén's species and that the species which he (Kirkaldy) was then selecting as the type species was *Oncotylus punctipes* Reuter, 1873 (*i.e.* the species to which Fieber had intended to refer when he entered the trivial name *tanaceti* Fallén as the name of a species of this genus). Nevertheless, under the *Règles* the type species of this genus was the true *Capsus tanaceti* of Fallén. The Commission were asked to designate *Oncotylus punctipes* Reuter, 1873, as the type species of this genus (China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 284).

(h) *Pachylops* Fieber, 1858

This genus was monotypical, the sole species referred thereto by Fieber being *Capsus chloropterus* Kirschbaum, 1855. It was considered that the citation of this name was due to a misidentification and that the species which Fieber intended to refer to was *Litosoma bicolor* Douglas & Scott, 1868. The Commission were asked to designate the latter species as the type species of this genus (China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 285).

(i) *Pilophorus* Hahn, 1826

This genus was monotypical, the sole species referred thereto by Hahn being *Cimex bifasciatus* Fabricius, 1775. It was considered that the citation of this name was due to a misidentification and that the species which Hahn intended to refer to was *Cimex clavatus* Linnaeus, 1767. The Commission were asked to designate the latter species as the type species of this genus (China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 286).

(j) *Tetyra* Fabricius, 1803

Curtis (1838) selected *Cimex maurus* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of this genus. It was considered that the species referred to under this name by Fabricius was *Cimex austriacus* Schrank, 1776 (the species which, under (b) above, the Commission were asked to designate as the type species of the genus *Bellocoris* Hahn, 1834). The acceptance of *Cimex maurus* Linnaeus as the type species of *Tetyra* Fabricius would (i) involve the transfer of the name *Tetyra* Fabricius from the American, to the European list, (ii) leave without a name the American genus now known as *Tetyra*, and (iii) cause the name *Eurygaster* Laporte, 1832 (a name of some importance in economic entomology as including pests of wheat) to fall as a synonym of *Tetyra*. Such consequences would be open to the strongest objection. It was accordingly proposed that the Commission should designate as the type species of *Tetyra* Fabricius, 1803, the species so selected by the next author after Curtis to select a type species for this genus, i.e. Kirkaldy (1900).

The species in question was cited by Fabricius under the name *Cimex arcuata* Fabricius, 1794, but that name was invalid, being a homonym of *Cimex arcuatus* Gmelin, 1789. The oldest available name for the Fabrician species was *Cimex antillarum*, a *nom. nov.* published by Kirkaldy in 1909. It was this nominal species which it was proposed that the Commission should designate as the type species of the genus *Tetyra* Fabricius 1803.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that unfortunately through some oversight the Commission File (file Z.N.(S.)144) dealing with the present series of applications had not been included among those which he had brought with him to Paris to assist the Commission in the consideration of problems calling for decision. So far as he could recall, no objections to the action proposed in these cases had been received from any source. These cases appeared to be exactly of the kind envisaged in *Opinion* 168. They all related to genera based upon misidentified species, where the acceptance of the type species actually cited (as contrasted with that intended) by the original author would certainly cause great confusion. In such cases the Commission were now under an obligation to use their plenary powers to avoid disturbance in accepted nomenclature.

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER ROBERT L. USINGER (U.S.A.) said that, as a hemipterist, he was familiar with the problem presented by the name *Gastrodes* Westwood (case (f) above) and was in full agreement with the conclusions reached by Dr. China. He accordingly supported the proposal that the plenary powers should be used to designate *Cimex abietum* Bergroth, 1914, as the type species of this genus.

IN THE ENSUING DISCUSSION the view was generally expressed that all the necessary data had been submitted by Dr. China in support of the remaining applications and that those applications were well founded. It was felt, however, that, before a final decision was taken on these cases, it was desirable to make sure, by reference to the Commission's file, that no adverse comment of any kind had been received from any specialist in the groups concerned. If any such adverse comments were found to have been received, the application concerned should be resubmitted to the Commission, but if no such adverse comments had been received, the Secretary to the Commission should prepare *Opinions* in the sense proposed.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

- (a) to set aside the designation by Westwood of *Cimex abietis* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the monotypical genus *Gastrodes* Westwood, 1840 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) ;
- (b) to designate *Gastrodes abietum* Bergroth, 1914, to be the type species of the foregoing genus ;

(2) to place the generic name *Gastrodes* Westwood, 1840, with the type species specified in (1)(b) above, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the trivial name *abietum* Bergroth, 1914 (as published in the binominal combination *Gastrodes abietum*), on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above ;

(5) as regards the names of the nine genera in the Order Hemiptera (Class Insecta) specified below :—

- (a) that, if an examination of the Commission's file Z.N.(S.)144 showed that no objection to the action proposed had been received from any source, the plenary powers should be used to designate as the type species of the genera concerned the species severally specified below, but that, if in any case it were to be found that such an objection had been received, the application concerned should be resubmitted to the Commission for further consideration :—

Name of genus (1)	*Name of species proposed to be designated, under the plenary powers as the type species of the genus specified in Col.* (1) (2)
Aquarius Schellenberg, 1800.	*Cimex najas* De Geer, 1773.
Bellocoris Hahn, 1834.	*Cimex austriacus* Schrank, 1776.

Beosus Amyot & Serville, 1843.	*Cimex maritimus* Scopoli, 1763.
Catoplatus Spinola, 1837.	*Tingis fabricii* Stål, 1868.
Dictyonota Curtis, 1827.	*Dictyonota strichnocera* Fieber, 1844.
Oncotylus Fieber, 1858.	*Oncotylus punctipes* Reuter, 1873.
Pachylops Fieber, 1858.	*Litosoma bicolor* Douglas & Scott, 1868.
Pilophorus Hahn, 1826.	*Cimex clavatus* Linnaeus, 1767.
Tetyra Fabricius, 1803.	*Cimex antillarum* Kirkaldy, 1909;

(b) that, where under Sub-Conclusion (5) (a) above, the plenary powers were used to designate as the type species of the genus concerned the species specified in Col. (2) of the table annexed to the said Sub-Conclusion, the generic name specified in Col. (1) should be placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" and the trivial name specified in Col. (2) as the name of the type species of the genus concerned should be placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";

(c) that in every case where, under (5) (a) above, the plenary powers are used to designate as the type species of a genus the species specified against the name of that genus in Col. (2) of the table annexed to that Conclusion, an *Opinion* should be rendered recording the decision so taken.

(*Note by the Secretary to the Commission.*—

I have examined the Commission's file Z.N. (S.) 144, and find (i) that Dr. R. I. Sailer (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) has registered his support for each of the proposals specified above, and (ii) that no adverse comment on the action proposed has been received from any source. (Signed) Francis Hemming, Secretariat of the Commission, London, N.W.1. 15th September 1948.)

Certain applications not yet published in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature": the Commission's files relating to, to be examined in turn

22. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the application submitted by Dr. W. E. China in regard to the names of certain genera in the Order Hemiptera (Class Insecta) which the Commission had just considered completed their examination of the applications that had so far been published in the *Bulletin of*

Zoological Nomenclature. In addition, however, there was a considerable number of applications relating to individual nomenclatorial problems awaiting decision, the texts of which, through lack of time and lack of funds, had not been published in the *Bulletin*. Some of these applications raised complicated issues and in these cases publication in the *Bulletin* was desirable before decisions were taken by the Commission, for such publication might serve to elicit valuable additional information. There were, however, a good many cases where the issue raised was very simple and the likelihood of additional information of value being elicited through publication in the *Bulletin* was consequently remote. Before leaving London for Paris, he (the Acting President), as Secretary to the Commission, had accordingly picked out the Commission Files (of the Z.N.(S.) Series) relating to a number of applications falling in this class, believing that in these cases the Commission would readily be able to reach decisions on the basis of an examination of the Z.N.(S.) files concerned, containing, as they did, not only the original applications submitted but also all the correspondence which had taken place in regard thereto. He (the Acting President) had brought the Commission Files in question with him to the present meeting and he hoped that the Commission would now proceed to examine them. In view of the considerable period which, owing to the war, had elapsed since some of these applications were first received, it was clearly very desirable that decisions should now be taken in every case where the Commission were satisfied that the action required was clear.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

> to examine, in turn, the Commission's Files (of the Z.N.(S.) Series) relating to applications in regard to individual nomenclatorial problems, which the Acting President, as Secretary to the Commission, had brought to Paris from London, with a view to reaching decisions on the questions submitted in every case where the evidence afforded by those Files showed clearly what action should be taken.

The trivial name "idas" Linnaeus, 1758, (as published in the binominal combination "Papilio idas") suppressed, and the trivial name "idas" Linnaeus, 1761 (as published in the binominal combination

23. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)60, containing an application submitted jointly by Dr. Henry Beuret (Neuewelt, Bâle, Switzerland) and Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) asking the Commission (1) to suppress the trivial name *idas* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio idas*), a name which, being a *nomen dubium*, served no useful purpose, in order (2) to validate the trivial name *idas* Linnaeus, 1761 (as published in the binominal combina-

" Papilio idas ") (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) validated, and its application defined, under the plenary powers, and matters incidental thereto

tion *Papilio idas*) for the species which had been known since 1871 up to about ten years ago by the trivial name *argyrognomon* Bergstrasser 1779 , a name which it had now been found was applicable to a different, though closely allied, species (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present application related to the name to be applied to a common Palaearctic species of butterfly, the nomenclature of which had become so confused that stability could not be secured unless the Commission used their plenary powers to assist that end. The confusion arose through the mistakes made in the past in applying trivial names to three very similar species, which might for convenience be called species " A," species " B," and species " C." Linnaeus in 1758 had recognised one only of these species (species " A "), to which he had applied the name *Papilio argus*. In 1761, he had, however, given the name *Papilio idas* to the Swedish subspecies of species " B," though, owing to the fact that species " B " and " C " both occurred in Sweden and their distinguishing characters had not been detected until more than a 100 years after Linnaeus's day, it was possible that, when he wrote the description of *Papilio idas*, he had before him specimens of both these species. The name so given was, however, invalid, being a homonym of *Papilio idas* Linnaeus, 1758, a name given to an Oriental Hesperiid which it had never been found possible to identify to the satisfaction of specialists in that group. The first major element of confusion was introduced by Schiffermüller and Denis (1775) who, on clearly recognising the characters which distinguished species " B " from species " A," applied to the former the trivial name *argus* Linnaeus, 1758 (which properly belonged to species " A ") and gave a new name (*aegon*) to species " A." This mistake persisted until 1871, when Kirby restored the name *argus* Linnaeus to its rightful owner. It was at this stage, however, that Kirby introduced the second major cause of confusion into this problem by applying to species " B " (which required a trivial name on ceasing to be known (incorrectly) as *argus* Linnaeus) the trivial name *argyrognomon* Bergstrasser [1779] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio argyrognomon*), believing that to be the oldest available name for the collective species " B." From then onwards until 1935, that species was almost universally known by that name. The opening phase of the next stage was marked by the discovery by Chapman in 1917 of the existence of a third species (species " C ") which had hitherto been confused with species " B." To this new species Chapman gave the trivial name *aegus* Chapman (in the binominal combination *Plebeius aegus*). It was not long before it was realised that other subspecies of species " C " had already been named, prior to the publication of the trivial name *aegus* Chapman, by authors who (erroneously) supposed that the insects in question were subspecies of species " B." In consequence, a general search of the literature was made for the purpose of determining the oldest available trivial name for species " C." This search led ultimately to the discovery by Dr. Beuret (one of the present applicants) of the third major error in the nomenclature of this group, namely the discovery that the trivial name *argyrognomon* Bergstrasser, for so long and so universally applied to species " B," was in fact applicable not to that species but to species " C." In retrospect, it was clear to him (the Acting President) that at that point the best course would have been to ask the Commission to use their plenary powers to suppress the name *argyrognomon* Bergstrasser, the transfer of which from species " B " to species " C " could not fail to cause the utmost confusion. However, that course had not been taken at that time, and in consequence there had followed a long period of confusion. This confusion had been greatly aggravated by the impossibility of determining what trivial name was properly applicable to the collective species " B," which once again (as in 1871) was without an accepted trivial name. This difficulty arose from the fact that the inadequacy of the original descriptions, the crude nature of the original figures (in those cases where figures had been published by the original authors) and the absence of type specimens made it impossible to determine whether any, and, if so, which of the trivial names given by early authors to nominal species commonly synonymised with species " B " really represented subspecies of that collective species or whether they represented subspecies of species " C." It was this nomenclatorial *impasse* which had led Dr. Beuret and other specialists to revert to a proposal originally advanced (in a different form) by Dr. Roger Verity (1913) that the best way to secure stability for the nomenclature of these species would be to acquire authority to apply to species " B " the trivial name *idas* Linnaeus, 1761. This proposal had many important advantages : (1) it involved no disturbance whatever in the nomenclature of other groups, for the trivial name *idas* Linnaeus, 1758, the suppression of which was presupposed by this proposal, would not cause a ripple anywhere, that name being regarded as a *nomen dubium* and in consequence not being in use by any author ; (2) the name *idas* Linnaeus, 1761, had never been applied by any author to any of the species here under consideration, apart from species " B " ; if therefore, that name were to be applied officially to species " B " (and, subspecifically, to the Swedish subspecies of that species), every worker would in future know to what species reference was being made when the name *idas* was used ; (3) the very early date (1761) of the trivial name *idas* provided an insurance against the risk of there being some earlier trivial name which would take priority over the name *idas* Linnaeus, 1761, for the collective species " B " ; (4) a settlement on these lines would not prejudice the taxonomic question of the relationship of insects " B " and " C," since any worker who (contrary to the present general opinion) might regard these two insects as conspecific would be free to treat as the name of a subspecies of the collective species " B " the name *argyrognomon* Bergstrasser (the oldest available name for the group of subspecies treated by the present applicants as together constituting the collective species " C ").

Continuing, the Acting President said that the present proposal was supported by all the leading specialists in the group concerned, including Dr. Roger Verity (Florence, Italy), Mr. N. D. Riley (British Museum (Natural History), London), the late Dr. A. Steven Corbet (British Museum (Natural History), London), Dr. V. Nabokov (Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, Cambridge, U.S.A.) and Mr. B. J. Lempke (Amsterdam, Netherlands). The Acting President added that, if, as he hoped, the Commission were now to use their plenary powers in the manner recommended, it would be necessary for them, when placing the trivial name *idas* Linnaeus, 1761, on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology," to specify that the name so stabilised was to be held to apply to the species which he had referred to under the name species " B " ; this could best be done by citing one of Chapman's figures of the male genitalia, those being the characters by which that species could most readily be distinguished from the species that he had referred to as species " C." At the same time the trivial name *argyrognomon* Bergstrasser [1779] (which in *Opinion* 169 the Commission had designated under their plenary powers as the type species of *Lycaeides* Hübner, [1819]) and the trivial name *argus* Linnaeus, 1758 (the type species of the genus *Plebejus* Kluk, 1802) should also be added to this " Official List," bibliographical references being inserted to show that the first of these names was to be applied to species " C " and the second to species " A."

(*Previous reference : Lisbon Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion* 23)

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) said that, as had been indicated by the Acting President, he strongly supported the present proposal. He was convinced that stability would never be attained in the nomenclature of this group of species without the use by the Commission of their plenary powers. The settlement proposed would, he felt confident, be welcomed warmly by all interested specialists.

IN DISCUSSION it was agreed that this was a particularly clear case for the use of the plenary powers to put an end to a state of confusion in nomenclature which could be remedied in no other way.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

  (a) to suppress the trivial name *idas* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio idas*) ;

  (b) to validate the trivial name *idas* Linnaeus, 1761 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio idas*) ;

  (c) to direct :—

    (i) that the trivial name *idas* Linnaeus, 1761 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio idas*), validated as specified in (b) above, should be applied to the species (the nominotypical subspecies of which was described by Linnaeus from specimens collected in Sweden), the male genitalia of which show the characters exhibited in the photograph published by Chapman (T. A.) in 1917 as figure 7 of plate III in Volume 14 of Oberthür's *Etudes de la Lépidoptérologie comparée* (photograph of the male genitalia of a specimen collected at Allos (Basses-Alpes, France) and figured as "*Plebeius argus* var. *alpina*") ;

    (ii) that the trivial name *argyrognomon* Bergstrasser [1779] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio argyrognomon*) should be applied to the species (the nominotypical subspecies of which was described by Bergstrasser from specimens collected in the "Bruchköhl Wald" in the "Graftschaft Hanau-Münzenberg"), the male genitalia of which show the characters exhibited in the photograph published by Chapman (T.A.) in 1917 as figure 23 on plate VIII in Volume 14 of Oberthür's *Etudes de la Lépidoptérologie comparée* (photograph of the male genitalia of a specimen collected at Versoix (Switzerland) and figured as " *Plebeius aegus* ") ;

(iii) that the trivial name *argus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio argus*) should be applied to the species (the nominotypical subspecies of which was described by Linnaeus from specimens collected in Sweden), the male genitalia of which show the characters exhibited in the photograph published by Chapman (T.A.) in 1909 as figure 1 on plate XX in Volume 3 of Tutt's *Natural History of the British Butterflies* (photograph of the male genitalia figured as "*Plebeius argus*");

(2) to place the trivial name *idas* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio idas*), suppressed under (1) (a) above, on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " :—

idas Linnaeus, 1761 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio idas*), as validated under (1) (b) above and as defined in (1) (c) (i) above ;

argyrognomon Bergstrasser [1779] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio argyrognomon*), as defined in (1) (c) (ii) above ;

argus Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio argus*), as defined in (1) (c) (iii) above ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

Six generic names in the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta) placed on

24. Arising out of the discussion recorded in the preceding Conclusion, THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that, when discussing the

the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" and three generic names in the same Order placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology"

(*Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion* 23)

trivial name *argyrognomon* Bergstrasser [1779] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio argyrognomon*), he had reminded the Commission that at Lisbon in 1935 they had used their plenary powers to designate the foregoing species as the type species of the genus *Lycaeides* Hübner [1819]. Now that the Commission had placed the foregoing trivial name on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology," it was desirable that they should stabilise also the name of the genus of which that species was the type species, by placing that generic name on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology." Action in this sense, if taken now, would merely anticipate action which would in any case be taken a little later, for, as the Commission would remember, they had agreed during their present Session (at the meeting noted in margin) that every nomenclatorially available name which was also the oldest available name for the genus or species concerned which had formed the subject of a decision by the Commission should now be placed on the appropriate "Official List," irrespective of whether a decision to that effect had been expressly recorded in the *Opinion* setting out the Commission's decision in regard to the name in question, and had invited him (the Acting President) in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission to examine all the *Opinions* so far rendered by the Commission for the purpose of giving effect to the foregoing decision. If, as he recommended, the Commission were now to deal expressly with the generic name *Lycaeides* Hübner, it would be convenient if at the same time they were to deal also with the other generic names, the type species of which had also been varied under the plenary powers on the same occasion. As could be seen by reference to the *Official Record of Proceedings* of the Meeting concerned (1943, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 23–25), there were altogether nine names involved. Of these, however, three names (*Latiorina* Tutt, 1909; *Orpheides* Hübner [1819]; *Spilothyrus* Duponchel, 1835) were the names of nominal genera which were duplicates, i.e. objective synonyms, of other nominal genera (*Agriades* Hübner [1819]; *Princeps* Hübner [1807]; *Carcharodus* Hübner [1819]). The Commission had only been asked to use their plenary powers in the case of these duplicate nominal genera, in order to prevent these latter from ceasing to be synonyms, a result which would otherwise have followed from the decision by the Commission to vary the type species of the genera having the older names. The names of these three duplicate genera should now be placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology." All the other names concerned were available and, with one exception, were in universal use. These names should therefore now be placed on the

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 42)

"Official List of Generic Names in Zoology." The exception was the name *Princeps* Hübner [1807], which was treated by all specialists as a synonym of *Papilio* Linnaeus, 1758, its type species, *Papilio demodocus* Esper [1798], being regarded as congeneric with *Papilio machaon* Linnaeus, 1758, the type species of *Papilio* Linnaeus. In spite, therefore, of the Commission having used their plenary powers to designate the type species of the genus *Princeps* Hübner [1807], he recommended that that name should not now be placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology."

Turning to the question of the admission to the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" of the trivial names of the type species of the genera discussed above, the Acting President said that two only called for comment. The species concerned were the type species respectively of the genera *Euchloë* Hübner and *Polyommatus* Latreille. In the first of these cases the difficulty was due to uncertainty as to the taxonomic limits of the collective species concerned, while in the second of the cases bibliographical uncertainties made it impossible at the present time to determine what was the oldest available name for the species concerned.

The type species of the genus *Euchloë* had for its trivial name the name *esperi* Kirby, 1871, which had originally been published as a subspecific trivial name, its author considering that the insect in question represented the South of France subspecies of a collective species to which the trivial name *ausonia* Hübner was then applied. While *esperi* Kirby was still accepted as a subspecies, most specialists now regarded the oldest available name for the collective species to which it belonged as *orientalis* Bremer, 1864. Some specialists, however, considered that the species was not confined to the Palaearctic Region but that the North American group of subspecies should be united with the Palaearctic subspecies. From the standpoint of these systematists, the oldest available trivial name for the collective species was *creusa* Doubleday, [1847] (as published in the binominal combination *Anthocharis creusa*). In order to avoid the appearance of passing judgment on these taxonomic questions, the Commission would be well advised to follow in this case the procedure which, on the suggestion of Alternate Commissioner Beltrán, they had agreed to adopt in analogous circumstances, when a similar case arose in connection with the addition of generic names to the "Official List of Generic Names." He (the Acting President) therefore recommended that the Commission should now place on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" all three of the trivial names which he

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 8th Meeting, Conclusion 6)

had mentioned but that in so doing, they should add a note, in the case of the name *esperi* Kirby, 1871, that this name was added to the "List," because it was both an available name and the name of the nominal species that was the type species of the genus *Euchloë* Hübner and that the addition of this name to the "Official List" did not prejudice the priority of the trivial names *creusa* Doubleday, [1847], or *orientalis* Bremer, 1864, from the standpoint of specialists who considered *esperi* Kirby to be congeneric with either of the insects referred to above. In the case of *orientalis* Bremer, a similar note should be added to make it clear that the entry of this name on the "Official List" did not prejudice the priority of the trivial name *creusa* Doubleday [1847], from the standpoint of those specialists who regarded *orientalis* Bremer and *creusa* Doubleday as conspecific.

As regards the trivial name of the type species of the genus *Polyommatus* Latreille, it must be noted that that trivial name (*icarus* Rottemburg, 1775, as published in the binominal combination *Papilio icarus*) was a homonym of the trivial name *icarus* Cramer 1775 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio icarus*), which applied to an entirely different species, which was the type species of the genus *Castnia* Fabricius, 1807. Both these trivial names had been published in 1775 and there was no means at present by which to determine which should be regarded as having priority over the other. The Commission would recall that earlier during the present meeting they had considered this difficulty when they had placed the generic name *Castnia* Fabricius on the "Official List" and had come to the conclusion that the trivial name of the type species of that genus could not be placed on the "Official List of Specific Names in Zoology" until the Commission, acting under their plenary powers, had determined the relative priority to be assigned to the works in which these trivial names had respectively been published in 1775. As a preliminary to taking such a decision, the Commission had invited him (the Acting President) in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission to prepare a Report containing recommendations on this subject. In these circumstances, the Commission could only defer consideration of the question of the addition to the "Official List" of the type species of the genus *Polyommatus* Latreille in the same way as they had deferred the corresponding question in regard to the trivial name of the type species of the genus *Castnia* Fabricius.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion* 16)

THE COMMISSION agreed:—

(1) to place the names of the undermentioned genera,

with the type species severally specified below, on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology":—

Name of genus (1)	*Type species of genus specified in Col.* (1) (2)
Agriades Hübner [1819]	*Papilio glandon* Prunner, 1798 (type species designated under the plenary powers)
Carcharodus Hübner [1819].	*Papilio alceae* Esper [1780] (type species designated under the plenary powers)
Euchloë Hübner [1819]	*Euchloë ausonia* Hübner var. *esperi* Kirby, 1871 (type species designated under the plenary powers)
Lycaeides Hübner [1819]	*Papilio argyrognomon* Bergstrasser [1779] (identified as in Conclusion 23 above) (type species designated under the plenary powers)
Polyommatus Latreille, 1804	*Papilio icarus* Rottemburg, 1775 (type species designated under the plenary powers)

(2) to place the undermentioned generic names on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology":—

Latiorina Tutt, 1909 (type species, by designation under the plenary powers: *Papilio glandon* Prunner, 1798)

Orpheides Hübner [1819] (type species, by designation under the plenary powers: *Papilio demodocus* Esper [1798])

Spilothyrus Duponchel, 1835 (type species, by designation under the plenary powers: *Papilio alceae* Esper [1870]);

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion* 23)

(3) to take note that *argyrognomon* Bergstrasser [1779] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio argyrognomon*), the trivial name of the type species of the genus *Lycaeides* Hübner, [1819], had already been placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";

(4) (a) to take note that *icarus* Rottemburg, 1775 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio icarus*), the trivial name of the type species of the genus *Polyommatus* Latreille, 1804, was published in the same year as *icarus* Cramer [1775] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio icarus*), a trivial name which applied to an entirely different species, that the relative dates of publication of these trivial names was unknown, and that there existed no means of determining the relative dates of publication of volume 6 of the journal *Naturforscher* (in which the first of these trivial names was published) and volume 1 of Cramer's *Uitlandsche Kapellen* (in which the second of these trivial names was published) until, on the receipt of the Report on the relative priority which it was desirable should be assigned to these, and certain other, works published in the same year, which, at the meeting noted in the margin, the Commission had invited its Secretary to prepare for their consideration, the Commission put an end to the present state of confusion in this matter by using their plenary powers to determine the relative priority to be assigned to the works in question ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion* 16(8))

(b) to place on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" whichever might, in the light of the Report referred to in (a) above, be found to be the oldest available trivial name for the type species of the genus *Polyommatus* Latreille, 1804.

(5) to place on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" the undermentioned trivial names, being the trivial names of the type species of the genera, the names of which had been placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" under (1) above, other than the names specified in (3) and (4) above, or, in the case of the generic name *Euchloë* Hübner [1819], the trivial names of earlier published nominal species regarded by certain specialists as being conspecific with the type species of that genus :—

alceae Esper [1780] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio alceae*) :
creusa Doubleday [1847] (as published in the

binominal combination *Anthocharis creusa*);

esperi Kirby, [1871] (as published as a subspecific trivial name in the trinominal combination *Euchloë ausonia* Hübner var. *esperi*) (without prejudice to the prior rights of the trivial names *creusa* Doubleday, 1847, and *orientalis* Bremer, 1864, from the standpoint of specialists who regard either of these as the names of subspecies of the same collective species as *esperi* Kirby, 1871);

glandon Prunner, 1798 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio glandon*);

orientalis Bremer, 1864 (as published as a subspecific trivial name in the trinominal combination *Anthocharis belemida* Hübner var. *orientalis*) (for those specialists for whom this name is the oldest available name for the collective species of which, from their standpoint, *esperi* Kirby, 1871, is a subspecies) (but without prejudice to the prior rights of the trivial name *creusa* Doubleday from the standpoint of those specialists who consider *orientalis* Bremer and *creusa* Doubleday to be conspecific);

(6) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1), (2) and (5) above.

The "Hildesheim List, [1839]", suppression of, for nomenclatorial purposes, under the plenary powers

25. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)196, containing an application submitted by Dr. H. Engel (Zoologisch Museum, Amsterdam) that the Commission should use their plenary powers to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes an anonymous and undated pamphlet of 20 quarto pages believed to have been published in 1839 and bearing the title *Verzeichniss einer aus Java übersandten sehr ansehnlichen Sammlung von Thieren aller Classen und einigen botanischen Gegenständen, welche bei dem Post-Spediteur und Senator Holzapfel in Stolzenau zum Verkauf ausstehen. Hildesheim.* This pamphlet, which, on the analogy of the "Erlangen List," suppressed by the Commission in 1935, might be called the "Hildesheim List," had been entirely unknown, until in 1940 or 1941 a unique copy, formerly in the Provincial Library at Leeuwarden, came to light. From the standpoint of stability in nomenclature, this pamphlet was extremely dangerous, for it contained new specific names (with accompanying Latin diagnoses) for one species of mammal and 18 species of birds. In order to prevent the chaos which might be expected to result if these unknown names were now to be substituted for the names currently used for the Javanese species concerned, Dr. Engel recommended that the Commission should at once use their plenary powers to suppress this pamphlet for nomenclatorial purposes.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that Dr. Engel was to be congratulated on having taken such prompt action to bring this pamphlet to the attention of the Commission, thereby making it possible to secure its suppression under the plenary powers before confusion and instability was introduced into nomenclature by the adoption of the numerous new names which it contained. The proposal submitted by Dr. Engel had been advertised but, as was only to be expected, no specialist had come forward in opposition to the action proposed.

IN DISCUSSION the view was expressed that it was most fortunate that through Dr. Engel's action it would be possible to prevent any harm being done through the discovery of this pamphlet. It was a thousand pities that equally prompt action could not have been taken to deal with two other unwanted discoveries (namely the discovery of Meigen's *Nouvelle Classification* (Order Diptera) and the "Erlangen List" (Order Hymenoptera)) before the introduction of the new names which they contained had had time to create chaos in the generic nomenclature of the two Orders concerned.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes the anonymous and undated pamphlet bearing the title *Verzeichniss einer aus Java übersandten sehr ansehnlichen Sammlung von Thieren aller Classen und einigen botanischen Gegenständen, welche bei dem Post-Spediteur und Senator Holzapfel in Stolzenau zum Verkauf ausstehen. Hildesheim* (the so-called "Hildesheim List"), believed to have been published in 1839 ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 47)

(2) placed on record that, in view of the decision specified in (1) above, any name, the first publication of which was in the "Hildesheim List" ranks for purposes of the Law of Priority (Article 25) and of the Law of Homonymy (Articles 34 and 35) as from the date subsequent to the "Hildesheim List" on which it was first published in conditions which satisfy the requirements of Article 25 and is to be attributed to the author by whom it was so published ; and that any such name which had never been subsequently published in conditions which satisfied the requirements of Article 25 possessed no status in zoological nomenclature ;

(3) agreed to render an *Opinion* recording to decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

Hübner (J.), [1806], " Tentamen : " (1) the valid names of the genera for certain of the species cited in, placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ; (2) procedure to be adopted for determining the valid generic names for the remaining species cited in

26. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that at this point he desired the Commission to take into consideration the question of the names to be used for the genera cited by Jacob Hübner in 1806 in the leaflet known as the *Tentamen*, having regard to the fact that *Opinion* 97 had ruled that the names there used for those genera were not available as from their appearance in that leaflet. This subject was dealt with in the Commission File Z.N.(S.)314, which he now invited the Commission to examine. It had to be admitted that the handling of this case in the past had been unfortunate, for, although an application to validate the *Tentamen* names under the plenary powers had been received before *Opinion* 97 had actually been published in October, 1926 (as could be seen from the note appended at the end of that *Opinion*), no action had ever been taken in regard to that application, apart from the publication of an announcement of its receipt. Moreover, none of the papers relating to that application had been included among the documents transferred to his (the Acting President's) custody on his election as Secretary to the Commission. On learning from Mr. N. D. Riley (British Museum (Natural History), London) in 1947 that Professor Wm. T. M. Forbes (Cornell University, Ithaca, U.S.A.) was interested in this matter, he had entered into correspondence with him about it. As a result Professor Forbes had furnished him with a copy of the petition referred to at the end of *Opinion* 97, from which it appeared that the date of the petition was 1926 and that its signatories had been " Wm. Schaus, August Busck, Carl Heinrich and others."

Continuing, the Acting President said that, as was inevitable, the situation had been gravely prejudiced from the standpoint of the supporters of the *Tentamen* names by the interval of over 20 years that had elapsed since they had submitted their application, for in the meantime specialists had taken *Opinion* 97 as constituting a final decision against the *Tentamen* names. Subject to certain possible exceptions among the generic names in the Sub-Order Heterocera, even those of the *Tentamen* names which, prior to the publication of *Opinion* 97, had enjoyed a certain currency had dropped out of use. Clearly, in these circumstances it could not be claimed for these names that there was any justification for the Commission now using their plenary powers to validate them, for such action, far from leading to greater uniformity, would in existing conditions merely introduce a new source of confusion. Equally, however, it was desirable that an end should be put to the confusion caused by the *Tentamen* controversy of a generation ago by determining which were the oldest available names under the *Règles* for each of the genera recognised by Hübner in the *Tentamen* (i.e. which were the oldest available names of the genera to which were referable the species cited by Hübner in the *Tentamen*). During his visit to the United States at the end of 1947, he (the Acting President), while in Washington, had had the benefit of a full discussion of this problem with Professor Forbes and with Dr. J. G. Franclemont and Dr. W. D. Field (Smithsonian Institution). At this conference Professor Forbes had explained that all that he now sought was that the Commission should take action under their plenary powers to validate such of the *Tentamen* names for genera of the Sub-Order Heterocera as were still in general use but which were invalidly so used, either because those names under the *Règles* (i.e. as published on the first occasion subsequent to the *Tentamen*) properly applied to some other genus or because there existed older available names for the genera in question. The problem did not arise in the case of the Sub-Order Rhopalocera, for one *Tentamen* name only was employed to-day for a genus belonging to that Sub-Order and that as from a later date. He (the Acting President) had felt that there was force in the view advanced by Professor Forbes and he had accordingly suggested that, in so far as either he or any other specialist in the Sub-Order Heterocera desired to see the preservation of a *Tentamen* name, he or they should submit applications suitably documented, to the Commission for the use of the plenary powers in those cases. Professor Forbes had replied that (as was indeed the case) the generic nomenclature of the Sub-Order Heterocera was in such a state that extensive bibliographical investigations might well be required before it was possible to establish the action which would be needed in order to validate the *Tentamen* names in question. At this point Professor Forbes had reverted to certain discussions which he had had with Mr. N. D. Riley in 1928. For his part, Professor Forbes said, he would be satisfied with any selection of the *Tentamen* names which Mr. Riley might decide to place before the Commission. He (the Acting President) had then given an undertaking that any adequately documented proposal on this subject which might be received from any source would be laid before the Commission as soon as possible ; in the meantime, he would himself, as a specialist in the Sub-Order Rhopalocera, prepare for the consideration of the Commission a proposal for the addition to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" of the names of the genera properly applicable to the species of that Sub-Order cited by Hübner in the *Tentamen;* this proposal would be entirely non-controversial, for (as already noted) no *Tentamen* name was now in use in that Sub-Order, except one with priority from a later date. Very shortly after his return to London from the United States, he had sent (on 28th January, 1948) the promised paper in draft to Dr. Franclemont, in order to make sure that that specialist had no objection of any kind to the action proposed. He (the Acting President) had not since then received any comments from Dr. Franclemont, who, he therefore concluded, saw no objection to the action proposed.

In conclusion the Acting President recommended the Commission to place on the " Official List " the oldest available names for ten of the genera in the Sub-Order Rhopalocera dealt with in the present application (the names of the remaining three genera having already been placed on the " Official List "), thereby settling once and for all the generic names applicable under the *Règles* to the species of that Sub-Order cited by Hübner in the *Tentamen*. As regards the corresponding names of genera of the Sub-Order Heterocera, he recommended that the Commission should place on record their desire that the earliest available names for the genera in question should also be placed on the " Official List " with as little further delay as possible (thereby putting an end to discussion as to the names applicable under the *Règles* to the genera of which the species so cited by Hübner were severally the type species) and that they should add a further declaration stating their willingness to give sympathetic consideration to any application for the use of the plenary powers to validate any generic name in the Sub-Order Heterocera that had originally appeared in the *Tentamen*, where it could be shown that the name in question was in general use, that confusion would ensue if, under the *Règles*, the name in use had to be changed, but that such change was inevitable, unless the Commission, by using their plenary powers, rendered such a change unnecessary.

IN DISCUSSION the view was generally expressed that it was desirable to lay the ghost of this old controversy by placing on the " Official List " the names of the genera which, under the *Règles*, were properly applicable to the species cited by Hübner in the *Tentamen*, exceptions being made in favour of *Tentamen* names where it could be shown that otherwise confusion was to be expected. The proposals submitted by the Acting President were calculated to secure this end and should therefore be accepted.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) agreed to take steps with as little further delay as possible to eliminate doubts regarding the generic names properly applicable to the 102 species of the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta) for which new generic names would have been provided in the leaflet entitled the *Tentamen*, which had been distributed to correspondents by Jacob Hübner in 1806, if it had not been for the fact that the names which appeared in that leaflet had been ruled to be unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes under *Opinion* 97, which, as agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, was, after clarification, now to be incorporated in the Schedule to the *Règles* in which all such decisions were now to be recorded ;

(2) agreed that the object specified in (1) above could best be secured by placing the generic names concerned on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) took note :—

(a) that, so far as concerned the Sub-Order Rhopalocera, no generic names which had originally appeared in the *Tentamen* were now in use in the sense in which they had applied in that leaflet with the exception of one name which now ranked for priority from a later date, that there was no difference of opinion among specialists regarding the generic names which, under the *Règles*, were properly applicable to the genera in question, and therefore that the way was now clear for placing on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " the names of the 13 genera in question, in so far as this had not already been done ;

(b) that, as regards the Sub-Order Heterocera, the present state of knowledge regarding the literature was not sufficient to make it possible, without further investigation by specialists, to determine what were the generic names properly applicable under the *Règles* to the species of that Sub-Order cited by Hübner in the *Tentamen* under generic names which, for the reason specified in (1) above were not available under the *Règles* as from the date of their appearance in that leaflet, and that, in consequence it was not at present possible to determine what were the generic names in this Sub-Order which should be placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology";

(4) took note :—

(a) that, of the names of the 13 genera referred to in (3)(a) above, the following three names had already been placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" :—

Apatura Fabricius, 1807 (the equivalent of *Potamis* of the *Tentamen*)

Argynnis Fabricius, 1807 (the equivalent of *Dryas* of the *Tentamen*)

Mechanitis Fabricius, 1807 (the equivalent of *Nereis* of the *Tentamen*)

(b) that the names of the remaining ten genera referred to in (3)(a) above, with their *Tentamen* equivalents, were as follows :—

Name of Genus	"*Tentamen*" *equivalent of generic name cited in Col* (1)
(1)	(2)
Aulocera Butler, 1867	*Oreas* (*Satyrus brahminus* Blanchard, 1844, (the type species of *Aulocera* Butler) being subjectively congeneric with *Papilio proserpina* [Schiffermüller and Denis], 1775, which would have been the type species of *Oreas* of the *Tentamen*, if that had been an available name)
Consul Hübner, [1807]	*Consul* (which, if it had been an available name, would have had the same type species as the later name *Consul* Hübner [1807])

Danaus Kluk, 1802	*Limnas* (*Papilio plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758 (the type species of *Danaus* Kluk) being subjectively congeneric with *Papilio chrysippus* Linnaeus, 1758, which would have been the type species of *Limnas* of the *Tentamen*, if that had been an available name)
Euphydryas Scudder, 1872	*Lemonias* (*Papilio phaeton* Drury [1773] (the type species of *Euphydryas* Scudder) being subjectively congeneric with *Papilio maturna* Linnaeus, 1758, which would have been the type species of *Lemonias* of the *Tentamen*, if that had been an available name)
Limenitis Fabricius, 1807	*Najas* (which, if it had been an available name, would have had the same type species as *Limenitis* Fabricius)
Nymphalis Kluk, 1802	*Hamadryas* (*Papilio polychloros* Linnaeus, 1758 (the type species of *Nymphalis* Kluk) being subjectively congeneric with *Papilio io* Linnaeus, 1758, which would have been the type species of *Hamadryas* of the *Tentamen*, if that had been an available name)
Papilio Linnaeus, 1758	*Princeps* (which, if it had been an available name,

	would have had the same type species as *Papilio* Linnaeus)
Pieris Schrank, 1801	*Mancipium* (which, if it had been an available name, would have had the same type species as *Pieris* Schrank)
Plebejus Kluk, 1802	*Rusticus* (which, if it had been an available name, would have had the same type species as *Plebejus* Kluk)
Pyrgus Hübner, [1819]	*Urbanus* (which, if it had been an available name, would have had the same type species as *Pyrgus* Hübner)

(5) agreed to place the undermentioned generic names, with the type species severally specified below, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " :—

Name of genus (1)	*Type species of genus specified in Col.* (1) (2)
Aulocera Butler, 1867	*Satyrus brahminus* Blanchard, 1844 (type species designated by Butler, 1867)
Consul Hübner [1807]	*Papilio fabius* Cramer [1776] (type species by monotypy)
Danaus Kluk, 1802	*Papilio plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Hemming, 1933)
Euphydryas Scudder, 1872	*Papilio phaeton* Drury [1773] (type species designated by Scudder, 1872)
Limenitis Fabricius, 1807	*Papilio populi* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Dalman, 1816)

Nymphalis Kluk, 1802	*Papilio polychloros* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Hemming, 1933)
Papilio Linnaeus, 1758	*Papilio machaon* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Latreille, 1810)
Pieris Schrank, 1801	*Papilio brassicae* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Latreille, 1810)
Plebejus Kluk, 1802	*Papilio argus* Linnaeus, 1758, as identified in Conclusion 23 above (type species selected by Hemming, 1933)
Pyrgus Hübner [1819]	*Papilio alveolus* Hübner, [1800–1803] [=*Papilio malvae* Linnaeus, 1758] (type species selected by Westwood, 1841) ;

(6) agreed to place on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" the thirteen "Tentamen" names specified in (4) above ;

(7) took note that the trivial names of the type species of the undermentioned genera, the names of which had been placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" under (5) above, had already been placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" :—

Danaus Kluk, 1802 (type species : *Papilio plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758)
Plejebus Kluk, 1802 (type species : *Papilio argus* Linnaeus, 1758) ;

(8) agreed to place on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" the undermentioned names, being the names of the type species of the genera placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" under (5) above, other than the genera specified in (6) above, save that in the case of the type species of the genus *Pyrgus* Hübner [1819], the trivial name now placed on the "Official List" is not the trivial name of the type species of that genus but is the trivial name of the nominal species subjectively identified with that species which has the oldest available trivial name :—

brahminus Blanchard, 1844 (as published in the binominal combination *Satyrus brahminus*)

brassicae Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio brassicae*)

fabius Cramer [1776] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio fabius*)

machaon Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio machaon*)

malvae Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio malvae*), as identified in (5) above

phaeton Drury [1773] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio phaeton*)

polychloros Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio polychloros*)

populi Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio populi*);

(9) with reference to (1), (2) and (3) (b) above, agreed to invite the Secretary to confer with specialists in the Sub-Order Heterocera and to submit proposals as soon as possible for the addition to the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " of the names applicable to the genera for which names would have been provided as from 1806 in Hübner's *Tentamen*, if the names introduced in that leaflet had been available under the *Règles*, and, with reference to that request, to place on record their readiness to use their plenary powers to validate, as from the *Tentamen*, 1806, the name for any of the genera in question where it could be shown to their satisfaction (i) that the name in question was in general use for the genus concerned, (ii) that it was nevertheless not the oldest available name for the genus concerned, but (iii) that confusion would ensue unless the Commission used their plenary powers to validate the name in question as from the foregoing date;

(10) agreed to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions relating to generic and specific trivial names in the Sub-Order Rhopalocera of the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta) specified in (5) and (7) above, and, as regards the corresponding names in the Sub-Order Heterocera of the foregoing Order, to invite the Secretary to the Commission to bring to the urgent attention of specialists in that Sub-Order the conclusions recorded in (1), (2) and (3) (b) above and the request recorded in (8) above.

"Papilio podalirius" Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera): identity of, determined under the plenary powers

27. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)183, containing an application submitted by the late Dr. A. Steven Corbet (British Museum (Natural History), London) that the Commission should use their plenary powers to determine the identity of the species bearing the trivial name *podalirius* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio podalirius*). After observing that, although this species was usually treated as having been first described by Linnaeus in the 12th edition of the *Systema Naturae*, it had, in fact, first been named in a footnote on page 463 of the 10th edition, Dr. Corbet had pointed out (i) that the bibliographical references there cited by Linnaeus included only one (Ray) in which a locality ("prope Liburnum portum in Etruria") had been given, but (ii) that Linnaeus had himself given the locality "Habitat in Europae australis et Africae Brassica." The locality "Europa australis" was appropriate to the species to which the trivial name *podalirius* Linnaeus was universally applied, but, according to current systematic ideas, the locality "Africa" (i.e. Palaearctic North Africa) was not, for the insect which occurred there (i.e. the insect, the oldest available trivial name for which was *feisthameli* Duponchel, 1832), which had formerly been regarded as a subspecies of *Iphiclides podalirius* (Linnaeus) was now regarded as being specifically distinct therefrom. The difficulty in the present case, Dr. Corbet had explained, arose from the fact that the Linnean collection (now in the possession of the Linnean Society of London) contained a specimen of the North African *feisthameli* Duponchel which bore a label "*podalirius*" in Linnaeus' own handwriting. Dr. Corbet had had no doubt that this specimen should be regarded as Linnaeus' "type" of the species which he had named *Papilio podalirius*. For the reasons explained, great confusion would arise if it were necessary to transfer the trivial name *podalirius* from the well-known European species to which it had always been applied to the North African insect, which had always been known by the name *feisthameli* ever since, in 1832, it had been distinguished by Duponchel as (subspecifically) distinct from *podalirius* Linnaeus. Dr. Corbet had accordingly asked the Commission to prevent such confusion from arising by using their plenary powers to determine the European species (as contrasted with the North African species) as the species to which the trivial name *podalirius* Linnaeus, 1758, should be held to apply. He had suggested that this end should be secured by the Commission selecting from the bibliographical references cited by Linnaeus for *Papilio podalirius* the reference to Ray, a decision which,

by making Livorno in Italy the type locality of this species, would eliminate all doubt as to its identity.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the danger of confusion to which Dr. Corbet had drawn attention was serious and would remain so, until, by using their plenary powers, the Commission made it clear how the *Règles* were to be applied. As a lepidopterist, he (the Acting President) was confident that action on the lines recommended by the late Dr. Corbet would be warmly welcomed by all interested specialists. This application had been advertised, but, as in the circumstances was to be expected, that advertisement had elicited no adverse comment from any source. The Acting President pointed out that the means by which the late Dr. Corbet had suggested that the Commission should attain the end desired was particularly happily chosen, for its adoption would not only determine beyond possibility of question the species to which the trivial name *podalirius* Linnaeus, 1758, should be applied, but would also serve to designate precisely the type locality of that insect (i.e. the type locality of the nominotypical subspecies of *Papilio podalirius* Linnaeus), a matter of some importance, in view of the fact that several European subspecies of this species had later been distinguished. The Acting President added that, in accordance with the excellent maxim adopted by the Commission on the advice of Alternate Commissioner Beltrán, when they had been considering the principles governing the admission of generic names to the " Official List," it would be well if, when the trivial name *podalirius* Linnaeus was added to the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names," the trivial name *feisthameli* Duponchel were also to be so added.

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) supported the proposal submitted by the late Dr. Corbet. This case was well-known to him and there was not the slightest doubt that serious confusion would arise if the trivial name *podalirius* Linnaeus were to be transferred to the North African insect now known by the trivial name *feisthameli* Duponchel, a transfer which, however, appeared inevitable, unless the Commission used their plenary powers in the sense proposed.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to direct that the reference to " Raj. ins. m. n. 3 " (i.e. Ray (J), 1710, *Hist. Ins.:* 111 n. 3) cited by Linnaeus, when in 1758 he first published the name *Papilio*

podalirius, was to be treated as representing the type specimen of that species and therefore that the trivial name *podalirius* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination cited above) was to be applied to the species there described by Ray from specimens taken at Livorno in Tuscany ("prope Liburnum, portum Etruriae");

(2) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology":—

podalirius Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio podalirius*), as defined in (1) above;

feisthameli Duponchel, 1832 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio feisthameli*) (without prejudice to the prior rights of the trivial name *podalirius* Linnaeus, 1758, from the standpoint of specialists who regard these as the names of subspecies of a single collective species);

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

Article 31 (need for elaboration of, to cover certain special cases): Secretary invited to prepare a comprehensive Report on

28. THE COMMISSION examined the undermentioned Commission Files containing proposals for the elaboration of the provisions in Article 31 in relation to the designation of holotypes and the selection of lectotypes submitted respectively by Dr. W. J. Arkell (then of the University Museum, Oxford) and Dr. H. E. Hinton (British Museum (Natural History), London):—

(a) File Z.N.(S.)179, containing a request received from Dr. Arkell for a ruling on the question of the procedure which an author should adopt when selecting a lectotype of a previously named species in cases where the author of the specific name had given both a description or figures of specimens and also bibliographical references to previously published descriptions or figures and, in publishing the name, had given an indication, such as the use of the expression "*nom. nov.*" (or an equivalent expression) or the selection as the basis for the new trivial name either of the personal name of the author to whose work a reference had been given, or of the name of the type locality of the species, which implied that the species thus given a new name was more closely linked to the material to which the cited bibliographical reference applied than to the new material before the author at the time when he published the new name ;

(b) File Z.N.(S.)180, containing a request received from Dr. Hinton as to the species to which a trivial name should adhere, if, when first published, it was applied both to certain material there described and also to a previously published nominal species, the name of which required to be replaced by reason of its being an invalid homonym, in a case where later examination shows that the author of the new trivial name was in error in identifying the material which he described with the species which required a new trivial name.

Dr. Arkell had illustrated the problem which he had submitted by referring to certain names published in 1938 by M. V. Maire for new species of the Order Ammonoidea (Class Cephalopoda). Dr. Arkell took the view that, where a new specific name was based partly upon a previously published description and partly upon additional material, the latter should be excluded from consideration when a lectotype is selected by a later author in every case where the author of the new name applies to it the expression "*nom. nov.*" (or an equivalent expression such as "*nom. mut.*"). Dr. Arkell further suggested that a *Recommandation* should be added to the *Règles* urging that in cases such as those referred to above authors, when selecting a lectotype for a nominal species, should give preference to the specimen described by a previous author even where the expression "*nom. nov.*" (or equivalent expression) was not used, in cases where the trivial name of the new species was based either upon the personal name of the previous author whose work was so cited, or upon the name of the type locality specified by the previous author. Dr. Arkell had realised that cases would arise where an author would be faced with the need to give a new name to a species already described or figured in the literature under a wrong name but where that description or figure was much less satisfactory than that which, with the help of additional material, the later author was in a position to give. To meet this type of case, Dr. Arkell suggested that a further *Recommandation* should be added to the *Règles* urging authors in such cases to describe the species as a new species and to avoid taking the name of the earlier author or of the type locality cited by that author as the basis for the new trivial name.

The application submitted by Dr. Hinton arose out of the circumstances in which in 1856 the specific name *Ptinus tectus* (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) had been published by Boieldieu. Boieldieu had published that name with a description of a Tasmanian insect but had explained that he regarded that insect as the same as that already named *Ptinus pilosus* White [1846], a name which, however, could not be used for this species, since it was an invalid homonym of *Ptinus pilosus* Müller, 1821 ; he (Boieldieu) accordingly renamed White's *pilosus* giving it the name *Ptinus tectus*. Dr. Hinton went on to explain that, while the description of the Tasmanian insect clearly applied to a true *Ptinus*, the species which White had named *Ptinus pilosus* was (as Blair (1928) had shown) not a Ptinid at all but an Anobiid. The question was to which of these totally different species did the name *Ptinus tectus* Boieldieu properly belong under the *Règles*. Dr. Hinton considered that the correct view to take was that on the same page Boieldieu had given the same name (*Ptinus tectus*) independently to two different species, that the relative priority to be assigned to those two names should be determined by reference to the position on the page on which they respectively occurred, and therefore that, as the name *Ptinus tectus* had been applied by Boieldieu to the Tasmanian species higher on the page than the place where he had stated that the name was a *nom. nov.* for *Ptinus pilosus* White, the name *Ptinus tectus* Boieldieu applied to the Tasmanian species, the same name given as a *nom. nov.* to White's *pilosus* being invalid as a junior primary homonym.

It was pointed out in discussion that, although the cases submitted by Dr. Arkell and Dr. Hinton respectively were not strictly identical with one another, they had one feature in common, in that they were both concerned with the identification (through the selection of a lectotype or otherwise) of the species (or the specimen) to which a given specific name should adhere when that name was based partly upon material before the author at the time when he drew up the description of the new species and partly upon a previously published description or figure, the new name being expressly designated by its author as a " *nom. nov.*" The approach to this problem by these specialists was noticeably different, Dr. Arkell considering that in such a case the material of the earlier author cited in the original description of the later published nominal species should alone be eligible for selection as the lectotype of the latter species, the material actually before the later author being ruled out for this purpose, while Dr. Hinton considered that, where the author of a name applied that name both to the material before him and also as the *nom. nov.* for a previously published species and it was later found that the former was not conspecific with the latter, the question as to which of the species concerned should be the species to which the new name should adhere should be settled in accordance with the principle of page, and, if necessary, line precedence. This difference in outlook suggested that before a decision was taken on these questions, it would be desirable to obtain information regarding the general practice in cases of this kind and on the general wishes of zoologists in this matter. It was felt therefore that as a preliminary to the consideration of these cases, the Secretary to the Commission should be asked to confer with interested specialists in different groups of the Animal Kingdom and in the light of the information so obtained to submit a full Report, with recommendations, for the consideration of the Commission at their meeting to be held at Copenhagen in 1953 during the next (XIVth) meeting of the International Congress of Zoology.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that the Secretary to the Commission should be invited to make a thorough study, in consultation with interested specialists, of the problems arising under Article 31 in relation to the identity of the species to which a given specific name applied, where that name was based partly upon specimens and partly upon a description previously published for a nominal species, the name of which or, as the case might be, the name applied to which by a previous author was rejected by the author of the new name, either because the name so used by the previous author was an unavailable name or because, when originally published, it had been applied to some other species.

Meuschen's Index to Gronovius, 1763-1781, " Zoophylacium Gronovianum " : rejection or, for nomenclatorial purposes

29. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)311, containing, *inter alia*, an application submitted by Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) asking the Commission to give a ruling that the names published by Meuschen (F. C.) in the index to Gronovius' *Zoophylacium Gronovianum*, 1763–1781, were not available under the *Règles*, that author on that occasion not having applied the principles of binominal nomenclature as required by Proviso (b) to Article 25.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that his work as a lepidopterist had led him before the outbreak of war in 1939 to examine carefully the index prepared by Meuschen to the non-binominal work, *Zoophylacium Gronovianum* of Gronovius, for the purpose of ascertaining whether that index contained any trivial names for species of butterflies of which account should be taken. That examination had shown clearly that, while in this index Meuschen had applied the principles of "binary" nomenclature in the sense in which that expression was then commonly used (i.e. he had recognised that the name of an animal should be constructed in such a way as to recognise two concepts, that of the genus and that of the species included in the genus) but that he had not applied the principles of binominal nomenclature, although many of the names there applied to species (in addition to the generic name) consisted of single words. This was the result mainly of the fact that in the great majority of cases these names consisted of univerbal trivial names copied by Meuschen from the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* of Linnaeus. In these circumstances, he had put this matter on one side, considering that no definite decision regarding the availability of new names in Meuschen's index could be reached until, at its next meeting the International Congress of Zoology reached a final decision on the meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire" (as used in the *Règles*) in the light of the comprehensive Report which at Lisbon it had been agreed should be prepared by the Commission for consideration at the XIIIth International Congress. All doubts as to the meaning to be attached to Proviso (b) to Article 25 (where the expression "nomenclature binaire" had hitherto figured) had been removed by the decisions taken during the present Session to recommend that the expression "nomenclature binominale" should be substituted for the expression "nomenclature binaire" and that the expression "principes de la nomenclature binominale" should be clarified. These recommendations had been approved by the Section on Nomenclature and on the following morning would be submitted to the Congress for final approval in *Concilium Plenum*. As the result of these decisions, a name was only to be accepted as available under Article 25 if throughout the work in which it was published the author of the name consistently applied the principles of binominal nomenclature. Meuschen in his index to Gronovius' *Zoophylacium Gronovianum* had certainly not consistently applied these principles, as could readily be seen from the photostat in the file of a portion of the index made from the copy in the British Museum that had been kindly furnished by Mr. N. D. Riley. Accordingly, no new names that figured in Meuschen's index possessed any availability under the *Règles* as from the date of being so published. He (the Acting President) accordingly invited the Commission to give a decision in this sense. The Acting President added that a decision on this question

(*Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 5th Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

(*Previous references: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 3 ; *6th Meeting, Conclusion* 67)

(Later reference: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion 53)

was needed as a preliminary to the correction of the errors in *Opinion* 13 (relating to the trivial name of the Sand Crab), proposals in regard to which would be brought before the Commission later during the present meeting and in connection with which the status of Meuschen's Index to the *Zoophylacium* had recently been raised by Dr. Fenner A. Chace, Jr. (U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C.).

IN DISCUSSION the view was expressed that it was very desirable that rulings should be given by the Commission in regard to the availability of names published in little known (and, as in the present case, scarce) books by old writers of questionable binominal standing, in order to give a guide to systematists as to which of these works were to be accepted and which ignored.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that in his index to Gronovius, 1763–1781, *Zoophylacium Gronovianum*, Meuschen (F.C.) had not consistently applied the principles of binominal nomenclature, as required by Proviso (b) to Article 25 ;

(2) that, in view of (1) above, no new name published in the foregoing index prepared by Meuschen possessed any availability under the *Règles* in virtue of having been so published ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

"Podura" Linnaeus, 1758, and "Tomoceros" Nicolet, 1842 (Class Insecta, Order Collembola) : designation of type species of, under the plenary powers ; "Podura" Linnaeus, 1758, correction in "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" of entry relating to

30. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)199, containing the undermentioned applications for the use of the plenary powers for the purpose of designating *Podura aquatica* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Podura* Linnaeus, 1758, in place of the unrecognisable nominal species *Podura plumbea* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Collembola) :—

(a) an application submitted by M. Hermann Gisin (Museum d'Histoire Naturelle, Geneva) ;

(b) an application submitted by Dr. Jirí Paclt (National Museum, Prague, Czechoslovakia).

In his application M. Gisin had explained that the type species of the genus *Podura* Linnaeus, 1758, was *Podura plumbea* Linnaeus, 1758, that species having been so selected by Latreille (1810). The Commission itself had accepted this species as the type species of this genus when (in *Opinion* 104) they had placed the generic name *Podura* Linnaeus, 1758, on the "Official List." Unfortunately, however, it was not possible definitely to identify the species to which Linnaeus had applied the name *Podura plumbea*, but it was clear that it was some species of the genus now known as *Tomocerus* Nicolet, 1842, of which, indeed, this nominal species was one of the originally included species. On the other hand, the name *Podura* Linnaeus was very well known as the name of the monotypical genus containing the species *Podura aquatica* Linnaeus, 1758. An enormous literature had grown up around the generic name *Podura* as used in this sense, and great confusion would be caused if it were necessary not only to abandon the use of the name *Podura* Linnaeus for the species *Podura aquatica* Linnaeus, but also, in future, to use that generic name in an entirely different sense, that is, as the name of the genus now known as *Tomoceros* Nicolet. For over 100 years every worker in the group, except Börner (1901) (who had subsequently recanted), had used the generic name *Podura* Linnaeus for *Podura aquatica* Linnaeus. It was the object of the present application to validate the universal practice of specialists in this matter. As regards the genus *Tomoceros* Nicolet, both the originally included nominal species were unrecognisable. Thus, if, as was highly desirable, the position of this generic name was to be regularised, it would not be possible to designate either of the originally included species to be its type species. M. Gisin suggested that the desired end should be secured by the designation, under the plenary powers, of *Macrotoma minor* Lubbock, 1862, as the type species of this genus, this being a well-established species which specialists were agreed was referable to this genus.

The application received from Dr. Paclt (which was concerned only with the name *Podura* Linnaeus) followed the same lines as that submitted by M. Gisin, Dr. Paclt expressing the view that a state of confusion would be created if it were necessary to accept the unrecognisable nominal species *Podura plumbea* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Podura* Linnaeus, 1758, and recommending that the Commission should therefore use their plenary powers to designate *Podura aquatica* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of this genus.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, when, in the process of preparing the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" for publication in book form, he, as Secretary to the Commission, had examined the *Opinions* under which the "Official List" had been built up, he had discovered that (in *Opinion* 104) the Commission had accepted the unrecognisable nominal species *Podura plumbea* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Podura* Linnaeus, 1758. It was clearly useless to place on the "Official List" a generic name that was indeterminate, through being based upon an unrecognisable species. He had therefore intended himself to make a proposal to the Commission in regard to this generic name in order that, by the designation, under the plenary powers, of a recognisable species to be the type species of this well-known genus, the position of the name *Podura* Linnaeus might be regularised before the "Official List" was published. The receipt of M. Gisin's application had, however, rendered such action on his part unnecessary. The advertisement of this case, subsequent to the receipt of the applications submitted by M. Gisin and Dr. Paclt, had elicited strong support for the action proposed from Dr. Harlow B. Mills (Chief, State Natural History Survey Division, Department of Registration and Education, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.). Interest in this application had been shown also by Mr. J. T. Salmon (Dominion Museum, Wellington, New Zealand). Finally (in a letter to M. Gisin, communicated by the latter to the Commission) Dr. Maynard (University of Rochester, New York, U.S.A.) had also intimated his support for the present proposal.

IN DISCUSSION, it was agreed that there were excellent grounds for using the plenary powers to regularise the position of the well-known generic name *Podura* Linnaeus, and therefore that the present applications should be approved.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—
   (a) to set aside all selections of a type species for the undermentioned genera of the Order Collembola (Class Insecta), made prior to the present decision :—
      (i) *Podura* Linnaeus, 1758
      (ii) *Tomoceros* Nicolet, 1842 ;
   (b) to designate the undermentioned species to be the type species of the genera specified in (1) above :—
      (i) *Podura aquatica* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the genus *Podura* Linnaeus, 1758 ;
      (ii) *Macrotoma minor* Lubbock, 1862, to be the type species of the genus *Tomoceros* Nicolet, 1842 ;
(2) to confirm the entry on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" of the generic name

Podura Linnaeus, 1758, subject to the substitution, as its type species, of the species specified in (1)(b)(i) above and of the insertion of a note that this species had been designated as the type species of this genus by the Commission under their plenary powers ;

(3) to place the generic name *Tomoceros* Nicolet, 1842 (type species, by designation under the plenary powers : *Macrotoma minor* Lubbock, 1862) on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " :—

aquatica Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Podura aquatica*)

minor Lubbock, 1862 (as published in the binominal combination *Macrotoma minor*) ;

(5) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (4) above.

" Amplypterus " Hübner, [1819] (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera): determination of type species of

31. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)204, containing an application from Senhor José Oiticica Filho (Museu Nacional, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil), asking for a ruling on the question of the type species of the genus *Amplypterus* Hübner [1819] (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), with special reference to the question of principle raised in this case. Senhor Oiticica had drawn attention to a passage in a paper (1865) in which Grote, commenting on Hübner's treatment of this genus at the time that he established it, remarked that it contained " discordant material, while *A. ganascus* is regarded evidently as the typical species of his genus by Hübner." Was this sentence, Senhor Oiticica asked, to be regarded as a selection by Grote of the foregoing species as the type species of this genus ? Senhor Oiticica had compared Grote's action with that of Crotch who in a paper on the type species of Sphingid genera had on several occasions referred first to one author as having selected a type species for a given genus and then to another as also having selected a type species for the same genus. Crotch's action had been rejected by subsequent authors as not constituting a selection of the type species of the genera in question within the meaning of Rule (g) in Article 30. Senhor Oiticica concurred in this view and considered also that the action by Grote in the passage quoted above should be similarly rejected, on the ground that there was no clear indication in that passage as to whether Grote himself regarded *ganascus* Stoll as the type species of the genus *Amplypterus*.

In discussion it was pointed out that, as the wording of Rule (g) in Article 30 had stood at the opening of the present Session, it had undoubtedly been too restrictive in character, for the then existing wording was such as to exclude from the scope of that Rule the very numerous cases where the currently accepted type selection rested upon a statement by a given author either (1) that a given previous author had selected a certain species to be the type species of the genus concerned in cases where no such previous selection had been made or (2) in the case of the older authors, that such and such a species was the type species of the genus in question as the result of the action of previous authors in "eliminating" from the genus the other originally included species. To meet cases of this kind the Commission had, during their present Session, agreed upon a liberalisation of the provisions of Rule (g). In so doing, they had agreed that while the revised wording should be such as to bring within the scope of the Rule cases where an author clearly stated that a given nominal species was the type species of the genus concerned, even where that author expressly stated that he was not himself then selecting that species for this purpose, the Rule in its amended form should provide also that it should be a condition of the acceptance of such a statement as a valid type selection that the author should make it clear that he himself regarded (for whatever reason) the species in question as the type species of the genus under consideration. In these circumstances, it was now clear that Senhor Oiticica had interpreted Article 30 correctly when he had rejected Grote's action in 1865 as not complying with the requirements of Rule (g) in that Article. In view of the clarification of that Rule agreed upon during the present Session, no question of principle arose any longer in connection with the present application, for it was evident from the words used by Grote that, while he had there expressed an opinion regarding the view held by Hübner, he had given no indication regarding his own opinion on the question at issue.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 72)

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the statement by Grote (1865) that Hübner, when establishing the genus *Amplypterus* Hübner [1819] (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), had evidently regarded *A. ganascus* Stoll "as the typical species of his genus," did not constitute

the selection by Grote, under Rule (g) in Article 30, of that species as the type species of the foregoing genus, for he had given no indication that he (Grote) himself accepted the above species as the type species of that genus ;

(2) that, in view of (1) above, the type species of this genus was the species first subsequently so selected in conditions which satisfied the requirements of the foregoing Rule (i.e. *Sphinx panopus* Cramer [1779], so selected by Kirby (1892)) ;

(3) to place the generic name *Amplypterus* Hübner [1819] (type species by selection by Kirby, 1892 : *Sphinx panopus* Cramer [1779]) on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to place the trivial name *panopus* Cramer [1779] (as published in the binominal combination *Sphinx panopus* Cramer) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(5) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (4) above.

Phylum Echinodermata : eight applications for the use of the plenary powers to validate accepted nomenclatorial usage submitted by Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark) : preliminary considerations relating to

32. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)18, containing an application submitted to the Commission by Dr. (now Commissioner) Th. Mortensen (Denmark) for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to validate the current use of the undermentioned generic names in the Phylum Echinodermata, in order to avoid the confusion which the strict application of the *Règles* would cause :—

(a) *Encrinus* Schultze, 1760 : proposed validation with *Encrinus liliiformis* Lamarck, 1801, as type species ;

(b) *Archaeocidaris* M'Coy, 1844 : proposed validation with *Cidaris urii* Fleming, 1828, as type species ;

(c) *Luidia* Forbes, 1839 : proposed validation, consequent upon the suppression of *Bipinnaria* Sars, 1835 ;

(d) *Echinocyamus* van Phelsum, 1774, and *Fibularia* Lamarck, 1816 : proposed validation with *Spatagus pusillus* Müller (O. F.), 1776, and *Echinocyamus craniolaris* Leske, 1778, as respective type species ;

(e) *Phyllacanthus* Brandt, 1835, and *Strongylocentrotus* Brandt, 1835 : proposed validation with *Cidarites (Phyllacanthus) dubia* Brandt, 1835, and *Echinus (Strongylocentrotus) chlorocentrotus* Brandt, 1835, as respective type species ;

(f) *Spatangus* Gray, 1825; *Ova* Gray, 1825; *Schizaster* Agassiz [1836]; *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825; *Moira* Agassiz, 1827; *Brissus* Gray, 1825: proposed validation with the undermentioned species as respective type species: *Spatagus purpureus* Müller (O. F.), 1776; *Spatangus canaliferus* Lamarck 1816; *Schizaster studeri* Agassiz, 1840; *Echinus cordatus* Pennant, 1777; *Spatangus atropos* Lamarck, 1816; *Spatangus brissus* var. *unicolor* Leske, 1778;

(g) *Diadema* Gray, 1825: proposed validation with *Echinometra setosa* Leske, 1778, as type species;

(h) *Pholidocidaris* Meek & Worthen, 1869, and *Lovenechinus* Jackson, 1912: proposed validation with *Lepidocentrus irregularis* Meek and Worthen, 1869, and *Oligoporus missouriensis* Jackson, 1896, as respective type species.

Prior to submitting the foregoing applications to the Commission, Commissioner Mortensen had consulted 38 leading specialists in the Class Echinoidea and had obtained their views on the action proposed to be recommended to the Commission. Dr. Mortensen had then embodied the results of these consultations in a paper entitled " A Vote on some Echinoderm Names " which was published in October, 1932 (*Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (10) **10**: 354–368). The following is the list of specialists recorded as having taken part in the foregoing consultations :—

F. A. Bather (*British Museum, London*); A. G. Brighton (*Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge*); A. H. Clark (*U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C.*); H. L. Clark (*Museum of Comparative Zoölogy, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*); J Cottreau (*Museum d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris*); E. D. Currie (*Hunterian Museum, Glasgow*); E. Deichmann (*Museum of Comparative Zoölogy, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*); A. M. Diakonov (*Zoological Museum, Leningrad*); L. Döderlein (*Munich*); Sv. Ekman (*Zoological Institute, Uppsala*); A. Faas (*Geological Committee, Leningrad*); D. M. Fedotov (*Zoological Laboratory, Leningrad*); W. K. Fisher (*Hopkins Marine Station, Pacific Grove, California*); T. Gislén (*Zoological Institute, Uppsala*); Seitaro Goto (*Tokio*); J. W. Gregory (*Geological Department, University, Glasgow*); J. A. Grieg (*Zoological Museum, Bergen*); H. L. Hawkins (*Geological Department, University, Reading*); R. Hecker (*Geological Museum, Leningrad*); S. Heding (*Zoological Museum, Copenhagen*); E. Hérouard (*Laboratoire de Zoologie, La Sorbonne, Paris*); N. v. Hofsten (*Zoological Institute, *Uppsala*); R. T. Jackson (*Museum of Comparative Zoölogy, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*); F. Klinghardt (*Museum f. Naturkunde, Berlin*); J. Lambert (*Paris*); I. Lieberkind (*Zoological Museum, Copenhagen*); Aug. Nobre (*Zoological Institute, Porto, Portugal*); H. Ohshima (*Zoological Laboratory, Fukuoka, Japan*); A. Panning (*Zoological Museum, Hamburg*); A. Reichensperger (*Zoological Institute, Bonn*); I. P. J. Ravn (*Palaeontological Department, University, Copenhagen*); W. E. Schmidt (*Prussische Geolog. Landesanstalt, Berlin*); W. K. Spencer (*Ipswich, England*); G. Stefanini (*Geological Institute, Pisa*); Dom Aurélien Valette (*Saint-Léger-Vauban, France*); C. Vaney (*Laboratoire de Zoologie, Lyon*); J. Wanner (*Geological Institute, Bonn*); N. Yakovlev (*Geological Committee, Leningrad*).

(*Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusions* 1–3)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the foregoing application had been received in November, 1932, but for various reasons it had not been found possible by his predecessor to make progress with any of these cases except that relating to the names *Luidia* Forbes and *Bipinnaria* Sars (case (c) above), on which proposals had been submitted for consideration by the Commission at their meeting held in Lisbon in September, 1935. At that meeting, the Commission had reached a decision on the foregoing case (a decision which had shortly afterwards been embodied in *Opinion* 129) and had held a preliminary discussion in regard to case (g) (*Diadema*) and case (d) (*Echinocyamus*). On the first of these cases, the Commission had invited Dr. Mortensen and himself (Commissioner Hemming) to confer together with a view to the submission of a fuller statement of the issues involved; case (d) had been postponed for further consideration. Continuing, the Acting President said that it had not been possible to carry further the consideration of these cases (except *Diadema* (case (g) above) on which a further statement prepared by Dr. Mortensen in consultation with himself had been submitted to the Commission) by the time when in 1939 the outbreak of war in Europe had first made it necessary temporarily to close down the Secretariat of the Commission and later, by the German occupation of Denmark, had made it impossible for him (the Acting President), as Secretary to the Commission, to communicate with Dr. Mortensen. Immediately after the close of the war, he had, however, written to Dr. Mortensen asking him to furnish concise statements, with full bibliographical data, in regard to each of the cases in question. In addition, he had visited Copenhagen in August, 1946, and had had an opportunity of a full discussion with Dr.

Mortensen in regard to these cases. As a result, Dr. Mortensen had submitted supplementary statements in regard to cases (b) (*Archaeocidaris*), (d) (*Echinocyamus*), (e) (*Phyllacanthus*), and (f) (*Spatangus*). Dr. Mortensen had intimated, as regards case (a) (*Encrinus*), that he would prefer that the work on the remaining stages of this application should be undertaken by some Crinoid specialist, while, as regards case (h) (*Pholidocidaris*), he had stated that he regarded this case as of much less importance than the others which he had submitted and in the circumstances did not propose to continue with it. The position was therefore that out of the eight cases submitted by Dr. Mortensen in 1932, one (*Luidia*) had been settled at Lisbon in 1935, and another (*Diadema*) during the present Session, one (*Encrinus*) had been transferred by Dr. Mortensen to other hands, and one (*Pholidocidaris*) had been withdrawn. The files containing the four remaining cases should, he (the Acting President) suggested, now be examined by the Commission with a view to decisions being taken on the issues involved.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note :—

(*Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 2*)

(a) that a decision on the third of the applications submitted by Dr. Mortensen (Copenhagen) (relating to the names *Bipinnaria* Sars, 1835, and *Luidia* Forbes, 1839) (case (c)) had been taken at the Session held at Lisbon in 1935 and that the only action which now required to be taken was to place on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names" the trivial name *ciliaris* Philippi, 1837 (as published in the binominal combination *Asterias ciliaris*), that being the oldest available trivial name of a species subjectively identified by specialists with the species bearing the trivial name *fragilissima* Forbes, 1839 (as published in the binominal combination *Luidia fragilissima*), the type species of the genus *Luidia* Forbes, 1839, placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" in *Opinion* 129 rendered by the Commission in consequence of the decision referred to above ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusion 27*)

(b) that a decision had already been reached during the present Session on the seventh of the applications submitted by Dr. Mortensen (relating to the name *Diadema* Gray, 1825) (case (g)) ;

(c) that Dr. Mortensen had suggested that the responsibliity for the remaining stages of the first of the applications which he had submitted (relating to the name *Encrinus* Schultze, 1760) (case (a)) could more appropriately be undertaken by a specialist in Crinoids than by himself;

(d) that Dr. Mortensen had intimated his desire to be permitted to withdraw the eighth of the applications which he had originally submitted, namely case (h) relating to the names *Pholidocidaris* Meek and Worthen, 1869, and *Lovenechinus* Jackson, 1912;

(2) agreed, with reference to (1)(a) above, to place the trivial name *ciliaris* Philippi, 1837 (as published in the binominal combination *Asterias ciliaris*) on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";

(3) invited the Secretary to the Commission, with reference to (1)(c) above, to arrange, in consultation with Dr. Mortensen, for a specialist in Crinoids to undertake responsibility for the remaining stages of the application relating to the name *Encrinus* Schultze, 1760, with a view to a decision being taken with as little further delay as possible either to use the plenary powers in this case or, alternatively, to place the foregoing generic name on the "Official List" in the sense in which it should be applied under the *Règles;*

(4) agreed, with reference to (1)(d) above, that, having regard to the wide publicity which had been given to the proposal that the plenary power should be used in the case of the names *Pholidocidaris* Meek & Worthen, 1869, and *Lovenechinus* Jackson, 1912, it would not be appropriate to allow that application to lapse, the proper course in such a case being to place on the relevant "Official List" the names for which it had previously been proposed that the plenary powers should be used, the entries so made to be those prescribed under the *Règles*, and accordingly invited the Secretary to the Commission to confer with specialists for the purpose of securing the submission to the Commission of alternative proposals on the foregoing lines, if that was the general wish of interested specialists;

(5) agreed to examine, in turn, the undermentioned Commission Files relating to the four remaining applications (cases (b), (d), (e) and (f)) submitted by Dr. Mortensen, for the purpose of reaching decisions on the questions so submitted :—
  (a) Commission File Z.N.(S.)320, relating to case (b) (*Archaeocidaris*) ;
  (b) Commission File Z.N.(S.)318, relating to case (d) (*Echinocyamus*) ;
  (c) Commission File Z.N.(S.)319, relating to case (e) (*Phyllacanthus*) ;
  (d) Commission File Z.N.(S.)317, relating to case (f) (*Spatangus*).

" Echinocrinus " Agassiz, 1841 (Class Echinoidea, Order Cidaroida), proposed suppression of, and " Archaeocidaris " M'Coy, 1844, proposed validation of, under the plenary powers : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained

33. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)320, containing an application submitted by Dr. (now Commissioner) Th. Mortensen (Denmark) on his own behalf and on that of a large group of other specialists in the Class Echinoidea that the Commission should use their plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Echinocrinus* Agassiz, 1841, and to validate the name *Archaeocidaris* M'Coy, 1844 (type species, by monotypy : *Cidaris urii* Fleming, 1828) (Class Echinoidea, Order Cidaroida). Dr. Mortensen explained that the early history of these names was clearly stated in a paper entitled " *Echinocrinus* versus *Archaeocidaris* " published by the late Commissioner F.A. Bather (United Kingdom) in 1907 (*Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.* (7) **20** : 452–456) and treated as part of the present application. Briefly, what had happened was that Agassiz (1841) had established the genus *Echinocrinus* for four species, of which the first was *Cidaris urii* Fleming, 1828 ; no type species was designated by Agassiz for this genus. In 1844, M'Coy recognised the genus *Echinocrinus*, including in it *Cidaris urii* Fleming and other species. Of *Cidaris urii*, M'Coy said that he " had long ago distinguished this species in " his " MSS., under the name of *Archaeocidaris*." By publishing this observation M'Coy had unwittingly established the genus *Archaeocidaris* with *Cidaris urii* Fleming as the type species by monotypy. Once the fact that these fossils were Echinoids unrelated to Crinoids had been recognised, specialists were attracted by the appropriateness of the name *Archaeocidaris* published, but rejected, by M'Coy, and various authors had adopted it in place of *Echinocrinus*, including ultimately (1849) M'Coy himself. Later, this name had been adopted by some authors as the basis of a family name. Great difference of opinion had existed among specialists for many years on the question of which of these generic names should be used for the species originally described by Fleming as *Cidaris urii*. The late Commissioner Bather, in the paper referred to above, had rightly concluded that, under the *Règles*, *Echinocrinus* Agassiz, 1841, was an available name, and must therefore take precedence over *Archaeocidaris* M'Coy, 1844. That conclusion was reached, however, six years before the grant to the Commission of plenary powers to suspend the *Règles* in certain cases and the fact that on this occasion Bather accepted *Echinocrinus* (though with reluctance) in preference to *Archaeocidaris* did not imply that he would have done so, if it had been possible at that time to seek the opposite solution by means of the plenary powers. This was clearly shown by the fact that many years later (1932) Commissioner Bather had joined with Dr. Mortensen in submitting the present application. This application had been one of the eight applications which had formed the subject of extensive preliminary consultation by Dr. Mortensen (as described in Conclusion 32 above). Of the 38 specialists then consulted, 35 had voted in favour of the submission of the present proposal to the Commission, while one (Lambert) had expressed the view that *Archaeocidaris* could be retained without resort to the plenary powers (i.e. that it was an available name under the *Règles*); only two of the specialists consulted (Gislén and von Hofsten) had withheld their vote, taking the view that, if this proposal were to be granted, it might lead to too many applications of a similar kind being brought forward. Dr. Mortensen strongly urged the adoption of the present proposal, arguing that it would be most unfortunate from every point of view if it were necessary to reject the highly appropriate name *Archaeocidaris* in favour of the absolutely misleading name *Echinocrinus;* such a change would be of no possible value to science and would be sure to lead to great confusion.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present application had been advertised, but that the advertisement had elicited no adverse comment on the action proposed.

IN DISCUSSION the view was expressed that, although the application had clearly established that the name *Echinocrinus* was inappropriate and that from this point of view the name *Archaeocidaris* was to be preferred, no clear evidence had been advanced in support of the argument that actual confusion was likely to ensue if the *Règles* were allowed to take their course in this case and the availability of *Echinocrinus* Agassiz formally recognised. On the other hand attention was drawn to the statement at the conclusion of the late Commissioner Bather's paper (submitted by Dr.

Mortensen as part of his application) that already by 1907 the generic name *Archaeocidaris* had given its name to a family (ARCHAEOCIDARIDAE). It would be helpful if, before a decision were taken on this application, further information could be obtained on the nature and extent of the confusion to be expected if the name *Archaeocidaris* were now to be relegated as a synonym of *Echinocrinus* An application supported by virtually the entire body of interested specialists in all parts of the world was not to be lightly placed on one side.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, before a decision was taken on the application submitted by Dr. Th. Mortensen (Denmark) on his own behalf and on that of a large group of interested specialists that the Commission should use their plenary powers (a) to suppress the generic name *Echinocrinus* Agassiz, 1841, and (b) to validate the generic name *Archaeocidaris* M'Coy, 1844 (type species, by monotypy: *Cidaris urii* Fleming, 1828) (Class Echinoidea, Order Cidaroida), it was desirable to obtain further information regarding the nature and extent of the confusion apprehended if in this case the *Règles* were permitted to take their course, *Echinocrinus* Agassiz, 1841, replacing the name *Archaeocidaris* M'Coy, 1844 ;

(2) to invite the Secretary to the Commission to communicate the foregoing conclusion to Dr. Mortensen and, in consultation with him and other interested specialists, to prepare for the consideration of the Commission a Report setting out the views expressed by such specialists on the issue referred to in (1) above, in order that, in the light of the views so expressed, the Commission might reach a final decision on the foregoing application.

" Echinocyamus " van Phelsum, 1774, and " Fibularia " Lamarck, 1816 (Class Echinoidea, Order Clypeastroida) : designation of type species of, under the plenary powers

34. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)318, containing an application submitted by Dr. (now Commissioner) Th. Mortensen (Denmark) on his own behalf and on that of a large group of other specialists in the Class Echinoidea that the Commission should use their plenary powers to secure that the generic names *Echinocyamus* van Phelsum, 1774, and *Fibularia* Lamarck, 1816 (Class Echinoidea, Order Clypeastroida), should be used in their long-established sense, the former for species of the flat type, the latter for species of the high globose type.

Dr. Mortensen explained that, when van Phelsum first published the generic name *Echinocyamus*, he placed in the genus so named what he regarded as 14 different species, some of which he stated had been taken in the Adriatic, the remainder in America. These " species " had not been given Latin trivial names by van Phelsum, but these were supplied four years later by Leske (1778). The figures given by van Phelsum were very poor, but certain of them left no doubt in Dr. Mortensen's mind that the species figured were of the flat type, while the reference to some of these specimens having been taken in the Adriatic confirmed this view, for only the flat species, known as *Echinocyamus pusillus* (Müller (O.F.), 1776), i.e. the species originally described as *Spatagus pusillus* by Müller, occurred in that area. Lamarck (1816) had not used the generic name *Echinocyamus* and had introduced a new name, *Fibularia*, in which he had placed three new nominal species, *trigona* (which was unrecognisable), *ovulum*, which was recognisable as a species of the high globose type and *tarentina*, which was another name for the flat type species known as *Echinocyamus pusillus*. The first author to recognise that the species of the flat type and those of the high globose type were generically distinct from one another was Agassiz (1841), who then applied the name *Echinocyamus* van Phelsum to the species of the flat type and *Fibularia* Lamarck to the species of the high globose type. Agassiz did not select type species for these genera, but from that time onwards until the publication of Lambert's paper in 1891, all specialists had proceeded on the assumption that *Echinocyamus pusillus* Müller (O.F.), 1776, was the type species of *Echinocyamus* van Phelsum and *Fibularia ovulum* Lamarck the type species of *Fibularia* Lamarck. In 1891, however, Lambert had published a paper in which he claimed to have proved that the figures given by van Phelsum for species of his genus *Echinocyamus* were of specimens of the high globose type and therefore that the name *Echinocyamus* van Phelsum must in future be transferred from the species of the flat type to those of the high globose type till then referred to the genus *Fibularia* Lamarck. At the same time Lambert applied the name *Fibularia* Lamarck to the species of the flat type, thus causing a most confusing exchange of meaning as between these two well-known generic names. Lambert's conclusions had been challenged by the foremost authorities on fossil Echinoids, e.g. by Cottreau (1894) and de Loriol (1897) and also by Dr. Mortensen himself (1907, 1910) ,who had rejected Lambert's conclusions and, in so doing, had been joined by almost every other specialist concerned. Nevertheless Lambert had maintained his point of view and in 1914 in his " Essaide nomenclature raisonée des Echinides," written jointly with Thiéry, the names *Echinocyamus* and *Fibularia* were used in the transposed sense. When Dr. Mortensen had held the consultation with specialists on which the present application was founded, all but one of the 38 specialists in question (for whose names see Conclusion 32 above) had supported the submission of the present application to the Commission, the single opponent being Lambert himself. The application now before the Commission in its resubmitted form was identical in object with the original petition of 1932, but it differed from that petition in one point of detail. In 1932 the applicants had asked that the Commission should designate as the type species of *Fibularia* Lamarck the species *Echinocyamus craniolaris* Leske, 1778, that name being then considered to be the oldest available name for the high globose species to which Lamarck had given the name *Fibularia ovulum*. It was now realised that this identification was incorrect, the species to which Leske had given the name *craniolaris* being not a species of the high type but the flat species which Müller (O.F.) in 1776 had named *Echinocyamus pusillus*. Accordingly, in the application, as resubmitted, the Commission were asked to designate *Fibularia ovulum* Lamarck as the type species of *Fibularia* Lamarck, thereby securing that that generic name should be used for the species of the high globose type.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT said that the present case had been advertised but the advertisement had elicited no adverse comment on the action proposed.

IN DISCUSSION the view was expressed that this was a case where confusion had arisen (or was calculated to arise) in the main not through the strict application of the *Règles* but through doubt as to how the *Règles* should be applied as the result of differences of opinion on the taxonomic question of the identity of the species included by van Phelsum in his genus *Echinocyamus*. In addition, however, there were strictly nomenclatorial issues involved, such as the doubt as to whether van Phelsum could properly be regarded as a binominal author (and therefore whether, without the use of the plenary powers, the name *Echinocyamus* had any standing as from van Phelsum, 1774) and the situation created by the selection by H. L. Clark (1914), as the type species of *Fibularia* Lamarck, of the species *Fibularia trigona* Lamarck, a species regarded by the present applicants as being unrecognisable. There was general agreement, however, that the plenary powers should be used in this case, in order to prevent the confusion which would inevitably follow the transfer of the name

Echinocyamus to the genus now known as *Fibularia* and of the name *Fibularia* to the genus now known as *Echinocyamus*.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to set aside all selections of type species for the undermentioned genera and to validate the generic names in question, with the species specified below as respective type species :—

Generic name validated (1)	*Species designated as the type species of the genus specified in Col.* (1) (2)
Echinocyamus van Phelsum, 1774.	*Echinocyamus pusillus* Müller (O.F.), 1776.
Fibularia Lamarck, 1816.	*Fibularia ovulum* Lamarck, 1816.

(2) to place on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " the generic names *Echinocyamus* van Phelsum, 1774, and *Fibularia* Lamarck, 1816, with the type species severally specified in (1) above ;

(3) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " :—

pusillus Müller (O.F.), 1776 (as published in the binominal combination *Echinocyamus pusillus*) ;
ovulum Lamarck, 1816 (as published in the binominal combination *Fibularia ovulum*) ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

" Phyllacanthus " (Class Echinoidea, Order Cidaroida) and "Strongylocentrotus (Class Echinoidea, Order Camerodonta) validated as of subgeneric status as from Brandt, 1835, under the plenary powers

35. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)319, containing an application submitted by Dr. (now Commissioner) Th. Mortensen (Denmark) on his own behalf and on that of a large group of other specialists in the Class Echinoidea that the Commission should use their plenary powers to direct that the names *Phyllacanthus* Brandt, 1835 (Class Echinoidea, Order Cidaroida) and *Strongylocentrotus* Brandt, 1835 (Class Echinoidea, Order Camarodonta) were to be treated as having been published by the above author as subgeneric names with *Cidarites* (*Phyllacanthus*) *dubius* Brandt, 1835, and *Echinus* (*Strongylocentrotus*) *chlorocentrotus* Brandt, 1835, as respective type species. Dr. Mortensen explained that the names *Phyllacanthus* and *Strongylocentrotus* were accepted by Agassiz and by all subsequent authors up to the year

1909. Both names, especially *Strongylocentrotus*, had in this way become widely known, not only in echinological literature, but also in biological literature generally. In 1909, however, Lambert and Thiéry had advanced the view that these names had not been published by Brandt as new subgeneric names, but as synonyms, respectively, of *Cidarites* Leske, 1778, and *Echinus* Linnaeus, 1758. On the basis of this conclusion, these authors had then proceeded to make a considerable number of consequential changes in the nomenclature of the group of which these genera formed part. The conclusions reached by Lambert and Thiéry in regard to Brandt's intentions when he published these two names were regarded as highly disputable by echinologist generally, by whom the changes in nomenclature suggested by Lambert and Thiéry had not been accepted. While in Dr. Mortensen's view, it was possible that these two names had, in fact, been looked upon by Brandt as synonyms (of *Cidarites* and *Echinus* respectively), the practical application of this conclusion would, in his opinion and in that of the large number of specialists associated with him in the present application, lead to great confusion and could not possibly be justified. The present application had been one of the eight applications on which Dr. Mortensen had consulted 38 leading specialists before (in 1932) he submitted his proposals to the Commission. Of these specialists (the names of whom have been given in Conclusion 32), 37 had voted in favour of the submission of the present proposals to the Commission, the sole exception being Lambert himself.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present case had been advertised but the advertisement had elicited no adverse comment on the action proposed. As regards the trivial name of the type species of the genus *Strongylocentrotus* Brandt, the Acting President observed that that species was invariably known by the trivial name *drøbachiensis* Müller (O.F.), 1776 (as published in the binominal combination *Echinus drobachiensis*) and that, in view of the fact that it was proposed in any case to use the plenary powers to validate the generic name *Strongylocentrotus*, and to designate its type species, it would be desirable at the same time to designate the foregoing nominal species to be the type species rather than the nominal species *Echinus* (*Strongylocentrotus*) *chlorocentrotus* Brandt, 1835, the name under which the taxonomic species concerned had been cited by Brandt, when he published the name *Strongylocentrotus*.

IN DISCUSSION the view was expressed that it would clearly be wrong to countenance the introduction of extensive and confusing changes in the nomenclature of a group, on the strength solely of an argument which (as here) rested upon a subjective interpretation of the intention of a given author when publishing a given name, when (as here) that interpretation was contested by almost the entire body of interested specialists. In view of the doubts arising from the interpretation by Lambert and Thiéry of Brandt's intentions when he first published the names *Phyllacanthus* and *Strongylocentrotus*, it would be necessary for the Commission to use their plenary powers, in order to put an end to further discussion. It would be desirable, however, that, in this, as in previous similar cases, the Commission should use those powers conditionally and to such extent (if any) as might be necessary. In other words, the Commission should make it clear that in using those powers for the purpose of validating the foregoing names as of subgeneric status as from Brandt, 1835, they did so only if and in so far as this course was necessary to attain the desired end and that their action in this matter was not to be construed as expressing an opinion on the question whether (as alleged by Lambert and Thiéry) the names in question had been regarded by their original author, not as subgeneric names, but as synonyms of the generic names, with which these names had been severally associated by that author.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—
  (a) to such extent as might be necessary :—
    (i) to validate the names *Phyllacanthus* Brandt, 1835, and *Strongylocentrotus* Brandt, 1835 (Class Echinoidea, Order Cidaroida) as of subgeneric status as from the date of being so published ;
    (ii) to designate *Cidarites* (*Phyllacanthus*) *dubius* Brandt, 1835, as the type species of *Phyllacanthus* Brandt, 1835,
  (b) to designate *Echinus drobachiensis* Müller (O.F.), 1776, to be the type species of the genus *Strongylocentrotus* Brandt, 1835 ;

(2) to place on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " the names *Phyllacanthus* Brandt, 1835, and *Strongylocentrotus* Brandt, 1835, validated as in (1) above and with the type species there severally specified ;

(3) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology":—

dubius Brandt, 1835 (as published in the binominal combination *Cidarites* (*Phyllacanthus*) *dubius*);

drøbachiensis Müller (O.F.), 1776, as published in the binominal combination *Echinus drøbachiensis*);

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

"Spatangus" Gray, 1825, "Ova" Gray, 1825, "Schizaster" Agassiz, [1836], "Echinocardium" Gray, 1825, "Moira" Agassiz, 1872, and "Brissus" Gray, 1825 (Class Echinoidea, Order Spatangoida): validation of current nomenclatorial practice in regard to, under the plenary powers

36. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)317, containing an application submitted by Dr. (now Commissioner) Th. Mortensen (Denmark) on his own behalf and on that of a large group of other specialists in the Class Echinoidea that the Commission should use their plenary powers in various ways to validate existing nomenclatorial practice in regard to six associated generic names in the foregoing Class, where, if the *Règles* were to be strictly applied, serious disturbance and consequential confusion would inevitably ensue. The generic names in question were: *Spatangus* Gray, 1825; *Ova* Gray, 1825; *Schizaster* Agassiz [1836]; *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825; *Moira* Agassiz, 1827; *Brissus* Gray, 1825. The following is a summary of the principal points made by Dr. Mortensen in regard to each of the foregoing names:—

(1) *Spatangus* Gray, 1825: This name had been used by the older authors (Klein, Leske) in a very wide sense under which it covered species now included in different families and even different Orders. Lamarck (1816) applied it to all the Spatangoids, of which, however, he cited only one by name, the new nominal species *Spatangus vulgaris* Lamarck (which had proved to be the same species as that now known as *Brissus carinatus*). If therefore Lamarck were treated as the author of the name *Spatangus*, that generic name would replace *Brissus* Gray and the species now known as *Brissus carinata* would have to be known as *Spatangus vulgaris* Lamarck. No one had, however, adopted this course. The true author of the generic name *Spatangus* in the modern sense was Gray (1825), who had placed in this genus only *Spatagus purpureus* Müller (O. F.), 1776. So regarded, the genus *Spatangus* Gray was monotypical with the above species as its type species. It was in this sense that the generic name *Spatangus* had been used by all subsequent specialists until in 1902 Lambert had advanced the view that this name should be used not in the sense

in which it had been employed by Gray in 1825 but in the sense in which it had first been used by Klein; that on this basis this generic name was not applicable to the species *Spatagus purpureus* Müller, which accordingly Lambert placed in a new genus to which he applied the name *Prospatangus*. Dr. Mortensen agreed that Gray had used the name *Spatangus* in a sense different from that of Klein. It would, however, in Dr. Mortensen's view, create the greatest confusion to abandon the use of the name *Spatangus* for *purpureus* Müller and to apply that name, as suggested by Lambert, to *Spatangus canaliferus* Lamarck, 1816.

(2) *Ova* Gray, 1825: The type species of this genus by monotypy was *Spatangus canaliferus* Lamarck, 1816. Accordingly under Lambert's view *Ova* Gray was an objective synonym of *Spatangus* as interpreted by that author. Dr. Mortensen asked that, when the Commission validated the name *Spatangus* as from Gray, 1825, and in consequence validated the designation of *Spatagus purpureus* Müller as the type species of that genus, they should also confirm the availability of *Ova* Gray, 1825, with *Spatangus canaliferus* Lamarck as its type species.

(3) *Schizaster* Agassiz [1836]: The type species of this genus was the fossil species *Schizaster studeri* Agassiz, 1840. This genus had been accepted even by Lambert and Thiéry notwithstanding their views on the generic position of *Spatangus canaliferus* Lamarck (see (1) above), a species which had formerly been referred to the genus *Schizaster*.

(4) *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825, and (5) *Moira* Agassiz, 1872: Gray had placed in the genus *Echinocardium* three species, of which the first was *Spatangus atropos* Lamarck, 1816. Agassiz, the next author to deal with this subject, rejected the name *Echinocardium* Gray, sinking it as a synonym of a new generic name of his own (*Amphidetus*). At the same time Agassiz transferred *Spatangus atropos* Lamarck, 1816, to his new genus *Schizaster*, in which also (as shown in (3) above) he placed the new species *Schizaster studeri*. In their "Catalogue raisonée" Agassiz and Desors cited *Echinus cordatus* Pennant, 1777, as the first species of the genus *Amphidetus* Agassiz, 1836 (which, as noted above, Agassiz had previously adopted in place of the earlier name *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825). In a later paper ("Synopsis des Echinides fossiles") Desors accepted *Echinocardium* Gray (sinking *Amphidetus* Agassiz as a synonym), citing *Echinus cordatus* Pennant as the first species. In the meantime Michelin had established the genus *Moera* Michelin, 1855, based upon *Spatangus atropos* Lamarck, which was accordingly treated by later authors as though it had been designated as the type species of the

genus *Moera* Michelin. Later it was found that this generic name was an invalid homonym, and Agassiz (1872) accordingly altered it to *Moira*. Since that date all specialists in the group had accepted the genera *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825, and *Moira* Agassiz, 1872, treating *Echinus cordatus* Pennant, 1777, as the type species of *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825, and *Spatangus atropos* Lamarck, 1816, as the type species of *Moira* Agassiz, 1872. Dr. Mortensen and his colleagues asked that this practice should be validated under the plenary powers.

(6) *Brissus* Gray, 1825: Gray had established this genus for four nominal species. The trivial names of the first and second of these species were *ventricosus* Leske and *unicolor* Leske respectively. The species bearing the first of these names had later been transferred to the genus *Meoma* Gray, 1851. Thereafter, the species bearing the trivial name *unicolor* Leske had been treated by all authors as the type species of the genus *Brissus* Gray. Dr Mortensen asked the Commission to validate this practice under their plenary powers.

In conclusion, Dr. Mortensen had expressed the view that the six generic names covered by the present application were so inextricably connected that they could not be treated separately. He accordingly asked the Commission to use their plenary powers to validate all the generic names in question, as from the authors and dates of publication, and with the type species, indicated in the application. This application had been one of the eight applications on which, before submitting it to the Commission (in 1932), Dr. Mortensen had consulted 38 leading specialists who were working on the group in various parts of the world. Of these specialists, 35 had voted in favour of the submission to the Commission of the present application, two (Bather; Brighton) had not voted, while one only (Lambert) had voted against the course proposed.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present group of applications had been advertised but the advertisement had elicited no adverse comment.

IN DISCUSSION the view was expressed that it was evident that the strict application of the *Règles* would completely change the way in which these generic names would in future have to be used. Great disturbance in nomenclatorial practice would be involved and this would inevitably lead to widespread confusion, in view of the very extensive literature, extending far beyond the literature of systematic zoology, which had accumulated around such names as *Spatangus* and *Echinocardium*. For these reasons and, having regard also to the strong support for these proposals expressed all but unanimously by the leading workers in this field in both Hemispheres, it was generally agreed that the objects sought by the applicants should be met by the Commission. On the other hand, some of the argument advanced in the application were not of a character which could be entertained by the Commission ; in particular, it was not possible either to ignore for the purposes of Articles 25 and 34 the uses of a generic name prior to a certain date (on the ground that the earlier authors had placed discordant material in the genus concerned), or, under Article 30 to accord any right to be accepted as the type species of a genus to a given species, on the ground only that it was the first of the species to have been cited, among others, under the name of the genus by its original author. In drawing up the conclusion of the Commission on these applications, it would be necessary to pay due regard to these considerations. Again in some cases (for example, in the case of the names *Schizaster* Agassiz [1836], and *Moira* Agassiz, 1872 (as derived from the invalid homonym *Moera* Michelin, 1855), it was not clear from the application how the species there mentioned as type species of the genera concerned had come to be recognised as such, whether that process had been in accordance with the Rules specified in Article 30 and therefore whether the use of the plenary powers was necessary or not.

In further discussion it was agreed that the plenary powers should be used, where this was necessary, to secure the ends sought in the present application, but that, where it was doubtful (for any reason) whether the use of those powers was necessary to achieve the desired object, it should be expressly recorded that the plenary powers were used for that purpose only to the extent that might be necessary therefor. The Acting President, as Secretary to the Commission, was accordingly invited to examine the present application from the foregoing point of view after the close of the present Session and, in the light of that examination, to draft the Conclusion on this matter in such a way as, in his opinion, would meet fully the objects set out in the application and also the points made in the discussion as recorded above.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

- (a) to suppress the undermentioned generic names :—
  - (i) *Brissus* Müller, 1781 (Class Echinoidea)

- (ii) *Brissus* Modeer, 1793 (Class Echinoidea)
- (iii) *Brissus* Link, 1807 (Class Echinoidea)
- (iv) *Brissus* Oken, 1815 (Class Echinoidea)
- (v) *Brissus* Dahl, 1823 (emend. of *Bryssus* Dejean, 1821) (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera)
- (vi) *Bryssus* Dejean, 1821 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera)
- (vii) *Brissus*, as used by any other author prior to the publication of *Brissus* Gray, 1825
- (viii) *Echinocardium* Leske, 1778, in so far as that name was published by that author as a generic name
- (ix) *Spatangus* Leske, 1778
- (x) *Spatangus* Modeer, 1793
- (xi) *Spatangus*, as used by any other author prior to the publication of *Spatangus* Gray, 1825 ;

(b) to validate the undermentioned generic names :—

- (i) *Brissus* Gray, 1825 (Class Echinoidea)
- (ii) *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825 (Class Echinoidea), in so far as this name requires to be validated by reason of the existence of the prior name *Echinocardium* Leske, 1778, suppressed, in so far as may be necessary in (a)(viii) above ;
- (iii) *Spatangus* Gray, 1825 (Class Echinoidea) ;

(c) to set aside all selections of type species for the undermentioned genera made prior to the present decision and to designate the species severally specified below to be the type species of the genera concerned :—

- (i) *Echinus cordatus* Pennant, 1777, to be the type species of the genus *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825, as validated, in so far as may be necessary, in (b)(ii) above ;

(ii) *Schizaster studeri* Agassiz (L.), 1840, to be the type species of the genus *Schizaster* Agassiz (L.) [1836] ;

(iii) *Spatangus brissus* var. *unicolor* Leske, 1778, to be the type species of the genus *Brissus* Gray, 1825, as validated in (b)(i) above ;

(iv) *Spatagus purpureus* Müller (O.F.), 1776, to be the type species of the genus *Spatangus* Gray, 1825, as validated in (b)(iii) above ;

(d) in so far as the use of the plenary powers may be necessary to secure that *Spatangus atropos* Lamarck, 1816, shall be the type species of the genus *Moira* Agassiz (A.), 1872, to set aside all selections of type species made for that genus prior to the selection of the above species by Clark (H. L.), 1917 ;

(2) to place on record that the reputed generic name *Brissus* Leske, 1778 (Class Echinoidea), has no existence under the *Règles*, as interpreted in *Opinion* 183 (now, as agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, to be incorporated in the *Règles*), having regard to the fact that this term was published by Leske in the nominative plural (as *Brissi*) instead of in the nominative singular, as required by Article 8 ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 12)

(3) to place the names of the undermentioned genera of the Class Echinoidea (Order Spatangoida), with the type species severally specified below, on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" :—

Name of genus (1)	*Type species of genus specified in Col.* (1) (2)
Brissus Gray, 1825, as validated in (1) (b) (i) above.	*Spatangus brissus* var. *unicolor* Leske, 1778 (type species designated under the plenary powers in (1) (c) (iii) above).
Echinocardium Gray, 1825, as validated in (1) (b) (ii) above.	*Echinus cordatus* Pennant, 1777 (type species designated under the plenary powers in (1) (c) (i) above).

Moira Agassiz (A.), 1872.	*Spatangus atropos* Lamarck, 1816 (type species designated under the plenary powers in (1) (d) above).
Ova Gray, 1825	*Spatangus canaliferus* Lamarck, 1816 (type species by monotypy).
Schizaster Agassiz (L.) [1836].	*Schizaster studeri* Agassiz (L.), 1840 (type species designated under the plenary powers in (1) (c) (ii) above).
Spatangus Gray, 1825, as validated in (1) (b) (iii) above.	*Spatagus purpureus* Müller (O. F.), 1776 (type species designated under the plenary powers in (1) (c) (iv) above).

(4) to place the undermentioned generic names and reputed generic names on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " :—

(i) the eleven generic names suppressed under the plenary powers, as specified in (1) (a) (i) to (xi) above ;

(ii) the reputed but non-existent generic name *Brissus* Leske, 1778, rejected under (2) above ;

(iii) *Prospatangus* Lambert, 1902 ;

(iv) *Moera* Michelin, 1855 ;

(5) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " :—

atropos Lamarck, 1816 (as published in the binominal combination *Spatangus atropos*)

canaliferus Lamarck, 1816 (as published in the binominal combination *Spatangus canaliferus*)

cordatus Pennant, 1777 (as published in the binominal combination *Echinus cordatus*)

purpureus Müller (O. F.), 1776 (as published in the binominal combination *Spatagus purpureus*)

studeri Agassiz (L.), 1840 (as published in the binominal combination *Schizaster studeri*) *unicolor* Leske, 1778 (as published as a subspecific trivial name in the trinominal combination *Spatangus brissus* var. *unicolor*)

(6) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (5) above.

Report by the Secretary to the Commission :

In accordance with the request of the Commission, I have re-examined the application submitted in this case for the purpose of determining how the objects set forth therein can be attained with the minimum use of the plenary powers, those powers being used only in respect of those purposes which can be achieved in no other way and being used conditionally " in so far as may be necessary " in cases where such use may be necessary to achieve the desired ends but that need is not clearly established. In the course of this re-examination, I have had the benefit of the advice of Dr. Mortensen. In addition, I have consulted a number of the books and papers cited in the present application. The conclusions which I have reached are as follows :—

(1) *Brissus* and *Spatangus:* If, as proposed, the generic names *Brissus* and *Spatangus* are to be made available in the sense in which they were respectively used by Gray in 1825, it will be necessary to use the plenary powers to suppress all prior uses of these names, and to validate these two names as from Gray, 1825. In view of the fact that Gray did not publish the names *Brissus* and *Spatangus* as new names and each, in order to acquire recognition under the *Règles*, requires the use by the Commission of their plenary powers, the same powers should be used to designate the type species of these genera. Quite apart from this consideration, the plenary powers would be necessary to ensure that the animal to which in 1778 Leske applied the trivial name *unicolor* should be the type species of this genus, for, even if that was the first of the originally included species to be selected by a later author to be the type species of this genus (which appears probable from, but is not clearly established in, the application submitted to the Commission), the type species of this genus would, under the *Règles* (Article 30, Rule (d)), be *Spatangus brissus* Leske, 1778, by absolute tautonymy, in view of the fact that the trivial name *unicolor* was published by Leske in the combination *Spatangus brissus* var *unicolor.* If it had not been for the consideration indicated above, it would not have been necessary to use the plenary powers to designate *Spatagus purpureus* Müller (O. F.), 1776, as the type species of the genus *Spatangus* Gray, 1825, for that nominal species (attributed, however, to Leske) was the sole species then cited (: 430) by Gray under the generic name *Spatangus* and would accordingly have been the type species by monotypy.

(3) *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825 : This name is usually treated as having been first published in 1825 by Gray (by whom it was doubtfully attributed to van Phelsum), but, as pointed out in the application, the term *Echinocardium* appears in Leske's *Additamenta* of 1778 as a translation of the Belgian expression " Egelhart " used by van Phelsum. In order, therefore, to obviate the risk of a claim later being advanced that Leske used this word as a generic name and therefore that *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825, is an invalid homonym, the conditional use of the plenary powers under the formula " in so far as the use of the plenary powers may be necessary " is desirable to suppress the name *Echinocardium* as used (and in so far as it was used) by Leske in 1778 as a generic name and to validate, in so far as necessary, the generic name *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825. As regards the type species of this genus, the plenary powers are certainly necessary to secure the acceptance of *Echinus cordatus* Pennant, 1777, for that nominal species was not cited by Gray (: 430) when he published the generic name *Echinocardium.*

(4) *Schizaster* Agassiz (L.) [1836] : The name *Schizaster* Agassiz is itself an available name, but the plenary powers are needed to secure that *Schizaster studeri* Agassiz should be its type species, since although that

name (binominal combination) appears in Agassiz's original description of the genus *Schizaster*, it was then only a *nomen nudum*, the trivial name in question not being published with an indication until 1840 (Agassiz, 1840, *Cat. Ect. Ech.* : 3).

(5) *Moira* Agassiz (A.), 1872 : This name (which was published as a substitute for the invalid homonym *Moera* Michelin, 1855), is an available name ; the species, *Spatangus atropos* Lamarck, 1816, which is commonly treated as its type species, is eligible for selection as such, having been one of the species included by Michelin in his genus *Moera*. Moreover, that species has certainly been selected as the type species of this genus, e.g. by Clark (H. L.) in 1917 (*Mem. Mus. comp. Zool.*, 46 : 195). It is not clear, however, either whether this was the first occasion on which this species was selected as the type species or whether any of the other originally included species had previously been so selected. In order to prevent any question being raised as to the validity of the selection of this species as the type species of this genus, it would be well, as in the case of the question of the availability of the generic name *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825 (discussed in (3) above), to use the plenary powers conditionally and " to such extent as may be necessary " to set aside all selections of type species for the genus *Moira* Agassiz, 1872, made prior to the selection of *Spatangus atropos* Lamarck as such by Clark (H. L.) in 1917.

(6) *Ova* Gray, 1825 : This name, wrongly attributed by Gray (: 431) to van Phelsum, is an available name and the type species of the genus so named is *Spatangus canaliferus* Lamarck, 1816, by monotypy. The plenary powers are thus not required either to validate this name or to secure that the species accepted as the type species of this genus should in fact be its type species. This name was only included in the present application because the type species of this genus had been (erroneously) alleged by Lambert (1902) to be referable to the genus *Spatangus*, as interpreted by that author.

In the light of the foregoing conclusions, I have drafted the record of the Commission's decision in this case in the terms set forth in Conclusion 36 of the Minutes of the 14th Meeting of the Paris Session, at which it was discussed, those terms giving effect to the decision of the Commission to meet the objects sought by Commissioner Mortensen in the present application and at the same time involving, as desired by the Commission, the minimum use of the plenary powers consistent with securing the objects referred to above.

(signed) FRANCIS HEMMING,

Secretariat of the Commission,
28, Park Village East,
Regent's Park, London, N.W.1,
England.

22nd August, 1949.

" Arachnoides " Leske, 1778, " Echinarachnius " Gray, 1825 (Class Echinoidea) validated under the plenary powers, and, with " Echinodiscus " Leske, 1778 (Class Echinoidea), placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology "

37. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)322, containing an application submitted by Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark) that the Commission should use their plenary powers to place on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " the well-known generic names *Arachnoides*, *Echinarachnius* and *Echinodiscus* (Class Echinoidea) in such a way as to secure that these names should be rendered available for use in their accustomed sense. The following is a summary of the main points made by Commissioner Mortensen in his application in regard to each of these names.

(1) *Arachnoides:* This name was commonly attributed to Klein (1734), although it possessed, as from that date,

no availability under the *Règles*, having been published by Klein prior to the starting point of zoological nomenclature. The first occasion subsequent to 1757 on which it was published by a binominal author was when it was so published by Leske in 1778. Leske, however, while accepting the concept represented by Klein's genus *Arachnoides*, had changed the name to *Echinarachnius*. Leske had cited under this genus only *Echinus placenta* Linnaeus, 1758. This species had been treated as the type species of *Arachnoides* by every subsequent author and had been definitely selected as such by Agassiz (L.) in 1841. The name *Arachnoides* had continued to be used in this sense by virtually all workers in the group until in 1914 Lambert and Thiéry had rejected the name *Arachnoides* of Klein and Leske in favour of *Echinarachnius* Leske, 1778, on the ground that the name *Arachnoides* had been used in a different sense by Linck in 1733 and therefore that this name, as used by Klein in 1734, was invalid, his *Arachnoides* being a junior homonym of *Arachnoides* Linck, 1732. The acceptance of the contention advanced by Lambert and Thiéry, involving the transfer of the name *Echinarachnius* from its well-known sense (see (2) below) to the genus universally known by the name *Arachnoides*, would lead to great confusion. Although other specialists in the group had not accepted the views of Lambert and Thiéry, Dr. Mortensen had thought it desirable, in order to avoid any danger of the great confusion which would follow such an acceptance, to ask the Commission to use their plenary powers to place the generic name *Arachnoides* Klein on the "Official List of Generic Names" with *Echinus placenta* Linnaeus as type species.

(2) *Echinarachnius* Gray, 1825: This genus had been characterised by Gray who had placed in it *Echinus placenta* Linnaeus (the species similarly placed therein by Leske in 1778 when he first published this generic name) and *Scutella parma* Lamarck, 1816. The latter species had been selected as the type species of *Echinarachnius* by Agassiz (L.) in 1841 on the same occasion as that on which (as shown above) he had selected *Echinus placenta* Linnaeus to be the type species of the genus *Arachnoides*. This genus, with the above species as type species, had been unanimously accepted by all subsequent workers until in 1914 Lambert and Thiéry (in the paper referred to in (1) above) had revived the name *Echinarachnius* Leske, 1778, for *Echinus placenta* Linnaeus, thus making the name *Echinarachnius* as used by Gray in 1825 an invalid homonym. It was part of Dr. Mortensen's proposal that, in order to avoid the confusion

which would otherwise be inevitable, the name *Echinarachnius* Gray, 1825 (type species: *Scutella parma* Lamarck, 1816) should be validated by the Commission at the same time as they similarly validated the name *Arachnoides* Klein.

(3) *Echinodiscus* Leske, 1778: This genus was established by Leske for a large number of species, of which *Echinodiscus bisperforatus* Leske, 1778, came to be regarded by all workers as the type species and was ultimately selected as such by Clark (H. L.) in 1911. Except for a short period when some authors referred the above species to the genus *Lobophora* Agassiz (L.), 1841 (a name which had to be rejected when it was found to be a homonym), all specialists in this group had accepted the genus *Echinodiscus* Leske (with the above species as type species) until in 1883 Pomel had advanced the claim that this name should be used as the generic name for *Echinus placenta* Linnaeus, on the ground that it had been used for that species (among other discordant material) by Breynius in 1732, that author's use of the name *Echinodiscus* thus antedating by one year the use by Klein (1734) of the name *Arachnoides* for the species referred to above. The admission of this contention which would involve the acceptance as from their original date of publication of names published before the starting point of zoological nomenclature (i.e. before 1758) would render the generic name *Echinodiscus* Leske an invalid homonym of the genus *Echinodiscus* Breynius. Although other specialists had not accepted the contention of Pomel, Commissioner Mortensen thought it desirable to ask the Commission to settle the matter once and for all by using their plenary powers to place *Echinodiscus* Leske, 1778 (type species: *Echinodiscus bisperforatus* Leske, 1778) on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology," at the same time that they disposed of the contention advanced by Lambert and Thiéry (also based on the action of an author prior to the starting point of zoological nomenclature) by validating the generic name *Arachnoides* in its well understood and generally accepted sense.

Summing up, Commissioner Mortensen had said that great confusion would arise in the nomenclature of three of the most widely known genera in the Class Echinoidea if the views advanced, in the case of the names *Arachnoides* and *Echinarachnius*, by Lambert and Thiéry and, in the case of the above names and also the name *Echinodiscus*, by Pomel were to gain currency. To prevent this from happening, he (Commissioner Mortensen) asked the Commission to use their plenary powers in the manner proposed.

IN THE DISCUSSION which ensued it was generally agreed that a case had been established regarding the likelihood of confusion arising in the event of current nomenclatorial practice in regard to the generic names *Arachnoides*, *Echinarachnius* and *Echinodiscus* being disturbed in the manner which would be inevitable if either the contention advanced by Lambert and Thiéry (1914) or that advanced by Pomel (1883) were to be accepted. The plenary powers should, it was agreed, be used to such extent as might be necessary to prevent this from happening. On the other hand, care would need to be taken to restrict the use of the plenary powers to those portions of the application (for example, the validation of the name *Echinarachnius* Gray, 1825, as against the earlier identical generic name *Echinarachnius* Leske, 1778), which could only be granted after the use of those powers. Those powers should not be used in respect of those portions of the application which dealt with difficulties arising from erroneous interpretations of the *Règles*, such as those arising from the action of Pomel (1883) and Lambert and Thiéry (1914) in claiming for names originally published before 1758 (i.e. before the starting point of zoological nomenclature as prescribed in Article 26) either (a) rights of priority prior to the date on which, subsequent to 1757, they had been given availability through being reinforced (by adoption or acceptance) by the same or another author or (b) the power, before being so reinforced, of influencing the availability of the same name as published by a binominal author subsequent to 1757.

At the conclusion of this discussion the Acting President, as Secretary to the Commission, was invited in this case (as in that of *Spatangus* referred to above) to examine the application from the foregoing point of view after the close of the present Session and, in the light of that examination, to draft the Conclusion on this matter in such a way as, in his opinion, would meet fully the objects set out in the application and also the points made in the discussion as recorded above.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 24)

(1) that, having regard to the interpretation of Article 25 given in *Opinion* 5 (the relevant provisions of which were now, as agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, to be incorporated in the *Règles*) :—

(a) the name *Arachnoides* Klein, 1734 (a name published prior to the starting point of zoological nomenclature, as prescribed in

Article 26) acquired no rights under the Law of Priority in virtue of Klein's work in which it originally appeared being republished in 1778, since this was merely a re-issue of the 1734 work, or in virtue of having been published in Leske's *Additamenta* (1778) to the foregoing work, since on that occasion Leske not only did not reinforce the name by adoption or acceptance (as prescribed by *Opinion* 5) but actually rejected it, publishing a new name, *Echinarachnius*, as a substitute for it;

(b) the name *Echinodiscus* Breynius, 1732 (a name published prior to the starting-point of zoological nomenclature), not having been given availability under the *Règles* by being re-inforced (through adoption or acceptance) prior to the publication of the name *Echinodiscus* Leske, 1778, possessed no status in zoological nomenclature as at that date and accordingly (contrary to the view erroneously expressed by Pomel in 1883) the name *Echinodiscus* Leske, 1778, is not to be rejected under Article 34 as an invalid homonym;

(2) to use their plenary powers:—

(a) to validate as from Leske, 1778, the generic name *Arachnoides* and to designate *Echinus placenta* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of that genus;

(b) to suppress the generic name *Echinarachnius* Leske, 1778, and all uses of that name prior to the publication of the name *Echinarachnius* Gray, 1825;

(c) to validate the generic name *Echinarachnius* Gray, 1825, and to designate *Scutella parma* Lamarck, 1816, to be the type species of that genus;

(3) to place the undermentioned generic names on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology":—

Arachnoides Leske, 1778, validated as in (2)(a) above (type species, by designation under the plenary powers, as specified in (2)(a) above: *Echinus placenta* Linnaeus, 1758)

Echinarachnius Gray, 1825, validated as in (2)(c) above (type species, by designation under the plenary powers, as specified in (2)(c) above: *Scutella parma* Lamarck, 1816);

Echinodiscus Leske, 1778 (type species, by selection by Clark (H. L.), 1911: *Echinodiscus bisperforatus* Leske, 1778);

(4) to place the undermentioned generic names on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology":—

Arachnoides Klein, 1778 (a reputed name rejected in (1)(a) above)

Echinarachnius Leske, 1778

Echinarachnius as used by any author subsequent to Leske, 1778, and prior to Gray, 1825

Lobophora Agassiz (L.), 1841;

(5) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology":—

bisperforatus Leske, 1778 (as published in the binominal combination *Echinodiscus bisperforatus*)

parma Lamarck, 1816 (as published in the binominal combination *Scutella parma*)

placenta Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Echinus placenta*);

(6) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (5) above.

Report by the Secretary to the Commission:

In accordance with the request of the Commission, I have re-examined the application submitted in this case for the purpose of determining how the objects set forth therein can be attained with the minimum use of the plenary powers. In the course of this re-examination I have had the benefit of the advice of Dr. Mortensen. In addition, I have consulted a number of the books and papers cited in the present application. The conclusions which I have reached are as follows:—

(1) *Arachnoides:* The plenary powers are certainly needed to validate this name as from 1778, the first date subsequent to the starting point of zoological nomenclature (1758), on which this name was published, for, as then published by Leske, it was a name taken from a pre-1758 author (Klein) which Leske not only did not re-inforce by adoption or acceptance (the conditions laid down in *Opinion* 5 as the sole means by which such a name can be given status under the *Règles*), but which he actually rejected in favour of a new name (*Echinarachnius*) proposed by himself. This being so, the plenary powers will be needed also to designate a type species for this genus.

(2) *Echinarachnius* Gray, 1825: Gray (: 428) did not look upon himself as publishing *Echinarachnius* as a new name, for he correctly referred this name to Leske, by whom (as shown in (1) above) it had been published in 1788. In order to be able validly to treat *Echinarachnius* as an available name first published by Gray in 1825, it will thus be necessary to use the plenary powers to suppress the name *Echinarachnius*

Leske, 1788, and all subsequent uses of that name prior to Gray, 1825, to validate the name *Echinarachnius* Gray, 1825, and to designate a type species for the genus so named.

(3) *Echinodiscus* Leske, 1778 : This is an available name, the objection raised against it by Pomel (1883) being totally groundless, being based upon a misconceived belief that a use put to a generic name by an author (Breynius) at a date (1732) prior to the starting point of zoological nomenclature (1758) can affect the status of the same name as published after 1758. There is therefore no need for the plenary powers to be used to validate this name. Nor is there any need for those powers to be used to designate a type species for this genus, for the species (*Echinodiscus bisperforatus* Leske, 1778) which it is desired should be recognised as such was in fact so selected by Clark (H. L.) in 1911.

In the light of the foregoing conclusions, I have drafted the record of the Commission's decision in this case in the terms set forth in Conclusion 37 of the Minutes of the 14th Meeting of the Paris Session, at which it was discussed, those terms giving effect to the decision of the Commission to meet the objects sought by Commissioner Mortensen in the present application and at the same time involving, as desired by the Commission, the minimum use of the plenary powers consistent with securing the objects referred to above.

(signed) FRANCIS HEMMING,

Secretariat of the Commission,
28, Park Village East,
Regent's Park, London, N.W.1,
England.

23rd *August*, 1949.

" Echeneis " Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Pisces, Order Discocephali), designation of type species of, under the plenary powers, the position of " Echeneis " Linnaeus on the " Official List " confirmed, and " Remora " Gill, 1862 (Class Pisees, Order Discocephali) added thereto

38. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)156, containing an application submitted by Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) as Secretary to the Commission that the Commission should use their plenary powers to designate *Echeneis naucrates* (an emendation of *neucrates*) Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758 (thereby giving valid force to the erroneous entry in regard to this generic name made in the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " under a decision recorded in *Opinion* 92), and at the same time to place on the " Official List " the generic name *Remora* Gill, 1862 (Class Pisces, Order Discocephali), with *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, when in 1944 he had been engaged in preparing the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " for publication in book form and in consequence had had occasion to examine in detail the entries made in that " List " under the *Opinions* rendered by the Commission, he had noted, when examining *Opinion* 92, that under that *Opinion* the generic name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, had been placed on the " Official List " with *Echeneis neucrates* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species, notwithstanding the fact (1) that among the synonyms cited by Linnaeus for *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758 (the other species placed by him in the genus *Echeneis* at the time when he first published that generic name) was the pre-1758 universal specific name, "Echeneis", and therefore (2) that, under the interpretation of Rule (d) in Article 30 given in the Commission's *Opinion* 16, *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, was the type species of the genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, by absolute tautonymy. It was immediately evident that it was necessary for the Commission either to correct the entry in the "Official List" in regard to this generic name or to validate that entry by the use of the plenary powers. It had appeared to him that the latter would be the more appropriate course, having regard to the fact (a) that the erroneous entry in *Opinion* 92 corresponded with the generally current practice of ichthyologists, and (b) that the strict application of the *Règles* would involve the confusing transfer of the generic name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, to the species now always placed in the genus *Remora* Gill, 1862, and the sinking of the latter name in synonymy. He had accordingly consulted Dr. C. M. Breder, Jr. (American Museum of Natural History, New York), Dr. Leonard P. Schultz (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) and Dr. Ethelwynn Trewavas (British Museum (Natural History), London), all of whom were in favour of the action now proposed. Dr. Schultz had added that Dr. Samuel F. Hildebrand and Dr. Robert R. Miller, both actively engaged on systematic work on ichthyology in the U.S. National Museum, concurred in the views which had been submitted in this case. It was evident therefore that there was massive support for the present application. In 1947, it had been published as Note 6 of the "Editorial Notes" attached to the reissue of *Opinion* 16, in view of the fact that in that *Opinion* the generic name *Echeneis* Linnaeus had actually been cited with its true type species *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758 (Hemming, 1947, in *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*, **1** : 287–297). No adverse comment on the action proposed had been received in consequence of the application being so published, nor had any such comment been elicited when later an advertisement of this application had been published in *Science* and *Nature*.

The Acting President added, with reference to the proposal that the name *Remora* Gill, 1862, should now be placed on the "Official List," that (as would be seen from the text of the application published in 1947), it was necessary first to clear up the question where, and by whom, the generic name *Remora* had been first published, in view of the fact that in the latest *Nomenclator* (Neave, 1940, *Nomencl. Zool.*, **4** : 21) references were given to two generic names *Remora*, each alleged to have been published prior to *Remora* Gill, 1862. The works in which these reputed generic names (*Remora* Gouan, 1770, and *Remora* Forster, 1771) had been published had been kindly examined by Dr. Leonard P. Schultz, whose conclusions were contained in a letter included in File Z.N.(S.) 156 which had been published in the present application (Schultz, 1947, *in* Hemming, *loc. cit.*, **1** : 293). It was clear from the particulars so furnished by Dr. Schultz that neither Gouan (1770) nor Forster (1771) had published the word " Remora " as a generic name and that this name had not been so published by any other author previous to Gill, 1862. In these circumstances the way was clear for putting the name *Remora* Gill, 1862, on the " Official List " without resorting in this matter even to a conditional use of the plenary powers (as he had originally suggested). It would, however, be necessary for the Commission to put on record that there were no such generic names as those attributed to Gouan and Forster. As regards the trivial name of the species proposed to be designated as the type species of the genus *Echeneis*, the spelling " neucrates " was an evident error of orthography (" faute d'orthographe ") and as such had been universally emended by specialists to " naucrates." This emendation had been accepted by the Commission itself, when in *Opinion* 92, they had placed the name *Echeneis* Linnaeus on the " Official List." It would be well to take the present opportunity to place on record that under Article 19 this was the correct spelling for this name.

IT WAS GENERALLY AGREED that in view of the confusion which would result from the strict application of the *Règles* in the present case, the desirability of avoiding (wherever possible) the making of changes in entries previously made in the " Official List," the wide and representative support for the present proposals received from leading ichthyologists and the complete lack of opposition of any kind, a case for the use of the plenary powers in the present instance had been established and that the application should be granted.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to set aside the original indication of *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Pisces, Order Discocephali) by absolute tautonymy (Article 30, Rule (d), as interpreted by *Opinion* 16) and in the place of that species to designate *Echeneis neucrates*

Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of this genus;

(2) that neither Gouan (1770) nor Forster (1771) when using the word "Remora," had used it as a generic name and therefore that the reputed generic names *Remora* Gouan, 1770, and *Remora* Forster, 1771, were to be rejected as having no existence under the *Règles;*

(3) to confirm explicitly the decision given implicitly in *Opinion* 92 (when the generic name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, had been placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology") that a "faute d'orthographe" was evident in the spelling of the trivial name *neucrates* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Echeneis neucrates*) and therefore that the spelling of that trivial name is, under Article 19, to be emended to *naucrates;*

(4) to confirm the position on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" of the generic name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species, by designation under the plenary powers under (1) above: *Echeneis naucrates* (emend. of *neucrates*) Linnaeus, 1758) (decision confirming action taken in *Opinion* 92);

(5) to place the generic name *Remora* Gill, 1862 (type species, by absolute tautonymy: *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758) on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology";

(6) to place the undermentioned reputed but non-existent generic names, rejected under (2) above, on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology":—
   (i) *Remora* Gouan, 1770;
   (ii) *Remora* Forster, 1771;

(7) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology":—

naucrates Linnaeus, 1758 (emendation, under (3) above, of *neucrates*, as published in the binominal combination *Echeneis neucrates*)

remora Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Echeneis remora*);

(8) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (7) above.

" Papilio iris " Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera): identity of, determined under the plenary powers

39. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)184, containing an application submitted by the late Dr. A. Steven Corbet (British Museum (Natural History), London) that the Commission should use their plenary powers to determine the identity of the species to which the trivial name *iris* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio iris*) should adhere and the locality to be accepted as the type locality of the species so named. Ever since it had been published, this trivial name had been applied to the Nymphaline butterfly of the genus *Apatura* Fabricius, 1807, which occurred in England and was there known as the " Purple Emperor." A recent examination of the butterflies in the Linnean collection, now in the possession of the Linnean Society of London, had convinced the late Dr. Corbet and Mr. W. H. T. Tams (British Museum (Natural History), London) that there was no evidence to support the allegations that had sometimes been made that Sir James Smith had altered labels on specimens in the Linnean collection; in consequence, both these specialists were of the opinion that the labels on these specimens could be relied upon and that by this and other evidence (e.g. the type of pin used, the style of setting employed) it was possible to identify the " types " of the majority of the species described by Linnaeus. In the case of the species now under consideration, Dr. Corbet had concluded that without doubt Linnaeus had based his description of *Papilio iris* not upon the " Purple Emperor " of England, but on the closely allied (and very similar) species which was widely distributed in Continental Europe (but did not extend to England), to which in 1775 Schiffermüller and Denis had given the trivial name *ilia* (in the combination *Papilio ilia*), the name by which the species in question had ever since been known. Dr. Corbet's conclusion, which was based in the first instance on his examination of the Linnean collection, had been confirmed by a manuscript note by Linnaeus in his own copy of the 10th Edition of the *Systema Naturae*, which could apply only to the species now universally known by the trivial name *ilia* [Schiffermüller and Denis]. Nevertheless, the description of *iris* Linneaus must have been based, at least in part, on descriptions of the " Purple Emperor " of England, for otherwise he could not have written (as he did) that this species occurred in " Anglia." The greatest confusion would occur if it were necessary to transfer the trivial name *iris* Linnaeus, 1758, from the Apaturid which occurred in England and on the continent of Europe to the allied species which occurred in Continental Europe but not in England. This was a case where, owing to uncertainty regarding the manner in which the *Règles* should be applied, there would be a perpetual risk of confusion until the Commission gave a ruling under their plenary powers as to which of the two species in question was the species to which the trivial name *iris* Linnaeus should be applied. Dr. Corbet had accordingly proposed that the Commission should use those powers to direct that this trivial name should be applied to the species to which it had always been applied and that of the two localities (" Germania " and " Anglia ") cited by Linnaeus in 1758 " Anglia " should be accepted as the type locality.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that it was difficult to imagine a case where the transfer of a trivial name from one species to another would cause more certain or more serious confusion than in the present case. Every lepidopterist who was concerned with this group would be in agreement with the present proposal. The application had been advertised but no objection had been received from any source to the action proposed. It would be necessary in this case, as in other similar cases (for example, the case dealing with the identity of the trivial name *plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binominal combination *Papilio plexippus*, which the Commission had considered at the meeting noted in the margin), to specify a good figure of an undoubted specimen of the species (the " Purple Emperor " of England) as the figure to be used in determining the identity of the species to which the trivial name *iris* Linnaeus, 1758, should apply. He suggested that for this purpose the figure of the ♂ given in fig. 1 on pl. 29 of South's " The Butterflies of the British Isles " should be selected for this purpose, the figure in question being a good one and the work in which it was published being inexpensive and widely known. The Acting President added that, when a decision had been taken on the present application, the difficulty in regard to the identity of the type species of the genus *Apatura* Fabricius, 1807, to which he had referred when earlier in the present meeting the Commission had been considering an application for the suppression under the plenary powers of the possibly earlier name *Apatura* [Illiger], 1807, would have been satisfactorily overcome.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusion* 7)

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion* 16)

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) said that he had no doubt that the application submitted by the late Dr. Corbet should be granted. Any other course would inevitably lead to the most serious confusion.

PURCHASED

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to direct that the trivial name *iris* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio iris*) should be applied to the species figured as *Apatura iris* by South (R.), 1906, *The Butterflies of the British Isles* as figure 1 on plate 29 and that the type locality of this species, i.e. the type locality of the nominotypical subspecies of this species, should be deemed to be " England " (" *Anglia* " of Linnaeus, 1758) ;

(2) that the foregoing definition of the meaning to be applied to the trivial name *iris* Linnaeus, 1758, should be entered against that trivial name, when, in accordance with the decision recorded in Conclusion 16(6) of the present meeting that name was inscribed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the trivial name *ilia* [Schiffermüller and Denis], 1775 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio ilia*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

The trivial names " ascanius " Linnaeus, 1768 (as published in the binominal combination " Papilio ascanius ") and " aristolochiae " Pallas (as published in the binominal combination " Papilio aristolochiae "), in so far as published prior to 1780, suppressed, and the trivial names " aristolochiae " Fabricius, 1775 (as published in the binominal combination " Papilio aristolochiae ") and " ascanius " Cramer, [1775] (as published in the binominal

40. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)186, containing an application submitted by the late Dr. A. Steven Corbet (British Museum (Natural History), London) that the Commission should use their plenary powers : (1) to suppress the trivial names *ascanius* Linnaeus, 1768 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio ascanius*) and *aristolochiae* Pallas [? 1775 or prior] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio aristolochiae*), and (2) to validate the trivial names *aristolochiae* Fabricius, 1775 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio aristolochiae*) and *ascanius* Cramer [1775] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio ascanius*) (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). Dr. Corbet had explained that the specific name *Papilio ascanius* Linnaeus, 1768 (which was based upon a Papilionid butterfly taken by Sparrman in Java) had been a *nomen dubium*, until in 1941 he had himself identified the insect so named as a form (form *diphilus* Esper [1793]) of the species to which in 1775 Fabricius had given the specific name *Papilio aristolochiae*. If, therefore, the *Règles* were to be strictly applied in the present case, the totally unknown trivial name *ascanius* Linnaeus, 1768, would replace the

THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, have great pleasure in expressing their grateful thanks to the UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION (U.N.E.S.C.O.) for the financial assistance afforded towards the cost of producing the present volume.

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Notice to subscribers regarding the arrangements made for the completion of volume 1 and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5

The following arrangements have been made for completing volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5 :—

Volume 1 : A concluding Part (Part 12), containing, *inter alia*, the Title Page, Table of Contents, and alphabetical subject index, will be published shortly.

Volume 2 : This volume, like Volume 1, will be devoted to the publication of applications in regard to nomenclatorial problems submitted by specialists to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. Publication will commence at an early date.

Volume 3 : This volume, which is now complete in 9 Parts, is devoted to the publication of the memoranda, reports and other documents considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at their meetings held in Paris in July 1948.

Volume 4 : This volume is devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July* 1948. Twenty-one Parts have been published and this volume is now complete except for the index which will be published in a concluding Part.

Volume 5 : At the request of the Bureau of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, this volume will be devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July* 1948, together with the Reports submitted to the Congress by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature.

INQUIRIES

All inquiries regarding publications should be addressed to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, and all inquiries regarding the scientific work of the Commission to the Secretary to the Commission at the following addresses :—

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7, England.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : Secretariat of the Commission, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.

Printed in Great Britain by METCHIM AND SON, LTD., Westminster London

VOLUME 4. Parts 19/21
pp. 543—651.

9th June, 1950

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

PURCHASED

BRITISH MUSEUM NATURAL HISTORY

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

CONTENTS :

The Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July 1948 :

Page

Conclusions of Fourteenth Meeting (*concluding portion*) 543—648

Conclusions of (Informal) Fifteenth Meeting 649—651

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948,

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature at the Publications Office of the Trust
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1950

Price One pound, twelve shillings.

(*All rights reserved*)

combination " Papilio ascanius ") (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) validated, under the plenary powers

name *aristolochiae* Fabricius, 1775. This would create great confusion, for not only was the latter name universally applied to the species in question, but, in addition, the trivial name *aristolochiae* had given its name to one of the principal groups into which for many years the species of the genus *Papilio* Linnaeus, 1758 (*sensu lat.*) had been habitually divided. Dr. Corbet accordingly asked that the trivial name *ascanius* Linnaeus, 1768, should be suppressed by the Commission under their plenary powers. Before, however, the position of the name *aristolochiae* Fabricius, 1775, could be regarded as assured, it was necessary also to safeguard it against a possible threat under Article 35 (Law of Homonymy), for Esper [1780], writing of the common European Zerynthiid (which he had referred to under the name of *Papilio polyxena* [Schiffermüller and Denis], 1775) had cited as a synonym the name *Papilio aristolochiae*, which he stated had been given to that species by Pallas. The long quotation from Pallas given by Esper, coupled with the locality " Das südliche Russland " strongly suggested that this name had appeared somewhere in that author's *Reise Prov. russisch. Reich.* The most careful search of the three volumes of that work had, however, failed to trace the place where that name had been published. The first volume of Pallas's *Reise* had been published in 1771, and there was thus a possibility that the name *Papilio aristolochiae* Pallas had priority over, and therefore invalidated, the name *Papilio aristolochiae* Fabricius, 1775, with which the present application was primarily concerned. In order to safeguard the position against the foregoing danger, Dr. Corbet had asked the Commission to use their plenary powers to suppress the trivial name *aristolochiae* Pallas (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio aristolochiae*) if, and in so far as, that name had been published by Pallas prior to the publication in 1775 of the trivial name *aristolochiae* Fabricius, 1775 (in the same binominal combination). Turning to the later history of the trivial name *ascanius* as used in the genus *Papilio* Linnaeus, Dr. Corbet had pointed out that in 1775 Cramer had used this name for a South American species, which ever since had been known by that name. Dr. Corbet asked that, in the interest of stability in nomenclature, the Commission should use their plenary powers to validate the use of this trivial name for that species, even though it was not altogether clear whether, in using that name, Cramer had looked upon himself as introducing a new name or as applying to the species in question the earlier name *ascanius* Linnaeus, 1768 (as published in the same binominal combination), which (as now explained) it was desired that the Commission should suppress.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present application had been drawn up by the late Dr. Corbet in consultation with himself and that it was on his suggestion that Dr. Corbet had added to that application the portion relating to the name *Papilio aristolochiae* Pallas, the reference to which by Esper he had discovered before the outbreak of war in 1939 when he had been making a systematic search of the older literature relating to the Sub-Order Rhopalocera. The late Dr. C. D. Sherborn, the late Dr. Corbet and himself had each spent many fruitless hours searching Pallas's *Reise* for the place where the foregoing name had first been published. Nevertheless, it was quite possible that a later investigator might succeed in finding that name either in the *Reise* or in some other work written by Pallas. Time-consuming searches of this kind were one of the worst features of the Law of Priority, and for this reason also he felt that it was most desirable that the Commission should now use their plenary powers to invalidate this name in so far as it might have been used by Pallas prior to the publication in 1775 for a different species of the same name (*Papilio aristolochiae*) by Fabricius. The Acting President added that this application had been advertised, but that the advertisement had elicited no adverse comments. This was only to be expected, for no responsible lepidopterist would wish to see current nomenclature disturbed by the resurrection of the two totally unknown names which formed the subject of the present application.

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) supported the proposal. Great confusion would result if the name *aristolochiae* Fabricius, 1775, had to be discarded for the species to which it was universally applied.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to suppress the trivial name *ascanius* Linnaeus, 1768 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio ascanius*) ;

(b) in so far as such use might be necessary, to suppress the trivial name *aristolochiae* Pallas (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio aristolochiae*), prior to the publication by Esper in [1780] of an extract, containing this name, from some work by Pallas ;

(c) to validate the undermentioned trivial names :—

aristolochiae Fabricius, 1775 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio aristolochiae*)

ascanius Cramer [1775] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio ascanius*) ;

(2) to place on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " the trivial names specified in (1)(a) and (1)(b) above ;

(3) to place on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " the trivial names specified in (1)(c) above ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

Zimmermann (A. E. W. von), 1777, " Specimen Zoologiae geographicae " : declared not available for nomenclatorial purposes ; Zimmermann, 1778-1783, " Geographische Geschichte ", declared an available work

41. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)182, containing an application submitted by the late Dr. Wilfred H. Osgood (Chicago) that the Commission should give a ruling that in the work entitled "*Specimen Zoologiae geographicae, Quadrupedum domicilia et migrationes sistens*," published in 1777, Zimmermann (E. A. W. von) had not complied with the requirements of Proviso (b) to Article 25 and therefore that no new name which first appeared in the above work possessed availability under the *Règles* as from the date of being so published. At the same time Dr. Osgood had asked for a ruling in the opposite sense as regards the later work published by the same author in the period 1778–1783 under the title *Geographische Geschichte des Menschen, und der allgemein verbreiteten vierfüssigen Thiere, nebst einer hieher gehörigen zoologischen Weltcharte.* Dr. Osgood had explained that, although these works were similar to one another, the earlier being written in Latin and the later in German, they were quite distinct and separate works, the *Geschichte* not being (as had sometimes been alleged) merely a translation of the *Specimen Zoologiae geographicae.* In spite of the arguments advanced by Allen (1902), specialists had continued to regard the *Specimen Zoologiae geographicae* of 1777 as a work in which Zimmermann had not complied with the requirements of Article 25 and had accordingly rejected new names published in that work. It would be helpful if the Commission were to place on record that this view of the status of new names in the *Specimen Zoologiae* was correct. On the other hand, Zimmermann's *Geschichte* had been accepted by mammalogists and the new names published in it were in general use. In this case, too, Dr. Osgood asked the Commission to confirm current practice and to give a ruling that the *Geschichte* of Zimmermann complied with the requirements of Article 25 and therefore that new names in that work were available under the *Règles* as from the date of being so published.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) explained that the present application arose indirectly out of a much earlier application relating to the status of the name *Dama virginiana* as published by Zimmermann in 1780 in the *Geschichte*. This question had been submitted to the Commission by Dr. Marcus W. Lyon, Jr. (Washington, D.C.) as long ago as 1915. No decision had ever been taken by the Commission on this application, which had only come to light when, consequent on his (the Acting President's) election as Secretary to the Commission, the surviving records of the Commission had been transferred to his custody. It was with the object of making some progress in this case that in 1944 he had applied to the late Dr. Osgood for assistance and advice. It was in his reply on this subject that Dr. Osgood had submitted the present application, taking the view that it was much more important that the Commission should give general rulings on questions relating to books of doubtful status than that it should consider the question of the availability of individual names published in such works. He (the Acting President) shared Dr. Osgood's view that it was important that the Commission should concentrate its attention on general questions, the settlement of which would (as in the present case) clarify the position as regards the status of all the new names published in a work, the status of which, under the *Règles*, had been a subject of discussion among interested specialists. It was not possible, however, on that account, for the Commission to ignore applications submitted to them in regard to the status of individual names first published in such works. The proper course was first to take a decision on the question of principle involved ; second, in the light of that decision, to give a ruling in regard to the status of the individual name concerned. He proposed, therefore, that consideration of Dr. Lyon's application in regard to the status of the name *Dama virginiana* Zimmermann, 1780, should be deferred until the Commission had reached decisions on the status of the work (*Geographische Geschichte*) in which that name had been published by Zimmermann, and of the work entitled *Das Natur-System der vierfüssigen Thiere*, published by Frisch (J. L.) in 1775

Later reference: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion 43)

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion* 42)

(on which also an application had been submitted by the late Dr. Osgood), in which the name *Dama* had been used by Frisch two years earlier than by Zimmermann (1777).

Turning to the subject matter of the present application, the Acting President said that that great authority, the late Dr. C. D. Sherborn, had examined both the *Specimen Zoologiae* (1777) and the *Geographische Geschichte* (1780) of Zimmermann, and had concluded (Sherborn, 1902, *Index Anim.*, Sectio prima : lvi) that the *Specimen Zoologiae* was not an available work under the *Règles*, but that the *Geographische Geschichte* was so available. When, eight months ago (December, 1947), he had visited the United States, he had discussed Dr. Osgood's application both with Dr. Remington Kellogg (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) and with Dr. Philip Hershkovitz (Chicago Natural History Museum), both of whom were in agreement with the recommendations submitted by the late Dr. Osgood. He (the Acting President) had himself examined copies of both the works by Zimmermann in question and, as a result, fully shared the views of the authorities to whom he had just referred. He accordingly commended Dr. Osgood's proposals to the Commission for their favourable consideration.

IN DISCUSSION, the view was generally expressed that the proposals submitted by the late Dr. Osgood should be approved. There was unanimity among the eminent specialists who had been consulted regarding the status which should be accorded to the two works by Zimmermann covered by the present application. A decision in the sense proposed would be of value as eliminating doubts regarding the status of two works which had in the past been a subject of discussion and would have the further advantage of assuring mammalogists that the current general practice in regard to these books was in strict accord with the *Règles*.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the book by Zimmermann (A. E. W. von), published in 1777 under the title *Specimen Zoologiae geographicae, Quadrupedum Domicilia et Migrationes sistens* was not available for nomenclatorial purposes under the *Règles*, Zimmermann not having applied therein the principles of binominal nomenclature, as prescribed by Proviso (b) to Article 25, and therefore that the names attributed to Zimmermann as from the foregoing work possessed no nomenclatorial status therefrom ;

(2) that in the book entitled *Geographische Geschichte des Menschen, und der allgemein verbreiteten vierfüssigen Thiere, nebst einer hieher gehörigen zoologischen Weltcharte*, published in the period 1778–1783, Zimmermann (A. E. W. von) had complied with the requirements of Article 25, that, in consequence, the foregoing work was available for nomenclatorial purposes, and that any new name, accompanied by an indication, published in it possessed status under the *Règles* as from the date of being so published;

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

Frisch (J. L.), 1775, "Das Natur-System der vierfüssigen Thiere" declared not available for nomenclatorial purposes

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion* 41)

42. THE COMMISSION turned next to examine Commission File Z.N.(S.)254, containing the second part of the application submitted by the late Dr. Wilfred H. Osgood (Chicago), namely the request that the Commission should give a ruling on the question of the availability of the new names published in 1775 in the work by Frisch (J. L.) entitled *Das Natur-System der vierfüssigen Thiere*. Dr. Osgood had explained that there was fairly general agreement that in this work Frisch had not complied with the requirements of Article 25 and therefore that this work should not be accepted. Occasionally, however, an individual name published by Frisch was brought forward by some author, and in consequence a general ruling by the Commission on the availability of this work would be helpful.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the status of this work had been considered by the late Dr. C. D. Sherborn who had come to the conclusion that in it Frisch had not applied the principles of binominal nomenclature. He had therefore rejected it, when compiling his monumental *Index Animalium* (Sherborn, 1902, *Index Anim.* (Sectio Prima): xxv). The same conclusion had been reached in an exhaustive study of the subject by Thomas and Miller (1905). When he (the Acting President) had recently visited the United States, he had discussed the question of the availability of this work with Dr. Remington Kellogg (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) and with Dr. Philip Hershkovitz (Chicago Natural History Museum), both of whom considered that Frisch's work did not satisfy the requirements of the *Règles* and should be rejected. The Acting President added that he had himself examined Frisch's *Natur-System* and was in complete agreement with the authorities referred to above. He accordingly recommended the Commission to give a ruling that this book was not available under the *Règles*. The more that the Commission gave rulings on the availability of books, the status of which was not absolutely self-evident and was therefore open to question, the more they would serve to promote stability in the nomenclature of the groups dealt with in such books.

IN DISCUSSION, there was general agreement that the Commission should dispose of this case by giving a ruling that Frisch's *Natur-System* was not an available work.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the book by Frisch (J. L.) published in 1775 under the title *Das Natur-System der vierfüssigen Thiere* was not available for nomenclatorial purposes under the *Règles*, Frisch not having applied therein the principles of binominal nomenclature, as prescribed by Proviso (b) to Article 25, and therefore that the names attributed to Frisch as from the foregoing work possessed no nomenclatorial status therefrom ;

(2) to render an *Opinion* recording the decision specified in (1) above.

" Dama " Zimmerman, 1780, and the specific name " Dama virginiana " Zimmerman, 1780 (Class Mammalia, Order Rodentia) : consideration of status of, postponed for additional information to be obtained

43. THE COMMISSION reverted to the study of Commission File Z.N.(S.)182, containing an application submitted by Dr. Marcus W. Lyon, Jr. (Washington, D.C.), that the Commission should give a ruling on the question of the availability of the name *Dama virginiana* Zimmermann, 1780 (*Geographische Geschichte*, **2** : 129), as the designation of the Virginian Deer. In submitting this inquiry, Dr. Lyon had furnished a quotation of the passage in Zimmermann's work in which the name *Dama virginiana* had appeared, which showed that Zimmermann had documented this name, both by citing bibliographical references to descriptions of the species published by previous authors (Ray, Lawson, Pennant) and by himself giving a description of that species. Thus, the only question which arose in connection with this name was whether the work in which it was published was an acceptable work under Article 25 of the *Règles*.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, in view of the decisions which the Commission had just taken regarding the status of Frisch (1775), Zimmermann (1777) and Zimmermann (1780), the position under the *Règles* of the specific name *Dama virginiana* had been completely clarified : (1) The decision on the *Geographische Geschichte* of Zimmermann (1780) made it clear that the specific name *Dama virginiana* was published in a work which came within the framework of the *Règles* and this, coupled with the fact that Zimmermann had then published a description for the species to which he applied this name, made it clear that the specific name *Dama virginiana* Zimmermann, 1780, possessed rights under the Law of Priority ; (2) the decision that the *Natur-System* of Frisch (1775) possessed no status under the *Règles* eliminated the reputed generic name *Dama* Frisch, 1775, from consideration and with it any doubt as to the availability of the generic name *Dama* Zimmermann, 1780. Continuing, the Acting President said that, while there was now no doubt that the generic name *Dama* Zimmermann, 1780, and the trivial name *virginiana* Zimmermann, 1780 (as published in the binominal combination *Dama virginiana*) were both available names under the *Règles*, there remained a question of quite a different order which he suggested should be considered by the Commission before these names were brought back into current literature from the oblivion in which they had lain for so long. The question here, to which his attention had been drawn by Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (British Museum (Natural History), London), was that the acceptance of *Dama* Zimmermann, 1780, as the generic name (by monotypy) of the Virginia Deer would involve a confusing transfer of that generic name to the American list from the European list, in which this generic name (attributed to a later author) was in use for the European Fallow Deer. In these circumstances, the Acting President felt that this case was essentially similar to the class of cases covered by the *Recommandation* which (at the joint meeting of the Commission and the Section on Nomenclature held on the forenoon of Friday, 23rd July, 1948) it had been agreed to insert in the *Règles* urging authors, on discovering, *inter alia*, that the type species of some genus of importance in applied biology was some species other than that commonly accepted as such, to report the case at once to the Commission for such action as they might consider proper, and in the meanwhile to refrain from using the generic name in the sense so found to be correct until such time as the decision of the Commission was made known.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion* 42)

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 8th Meeting, Conclusion* 4(3))

IN DISCUSSION general agreement was expressed with the view that before the generic name *Dama* Zimmermann, 1780, was transferred from the European Fallow Deer to the Virginia Deer of America, it was desirable that the Commission should be given an opportunity of considering whether confusion was likely to result therefrom and therefore whether the use of the plenary powers was called for,

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, having regard to the decisions just taken (a) that Zimmermann, 1780, *Geographische Geschichte* was an available work but (b) that Frisch, 1775, *Das Natur-System* was to be rejected as an unavailable work, the undermentioned names, each having been published with a description or an indication, were available names in the Class Mammalia (Order Ungulata) :—

(a) the generic name *Dama* Zimmermann, 1780 ;

(b) the trivial name *virginiana* Zimmermann, 1780 (as published in the binominal combination *Dama virginiana*) ;

(2) having regard to the representations received as to the confusion to be expected if the generic name *Dama* was now to be transferred from the Fallow Deer of Europe to the Virginia Deer of America, to examine as quickly as possible, in conjunction with interested specialists, the question whether the degree of confusion likely to result from the foregoing transfer was such as to call for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to secure the continued employment of the generic name *Dama* in its accustomed sense ;

(3) to invite the Secretary to the Commission, by publishing the foregoing decision in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and otherwise, to obtain as rapidly as possible the views of interested specialists on the question of the future status to be accorded to the generic name *Dama* Zimmermann, 1780, and the specific name *Dama virginiana* Zimmermann, 1780, with a view to a decision being taken by the Commission thereon with as little further delay as possible ;

(4) to recommend specialists to refrain from transferring the generic name *Dama* from the Fallow Deer of Europe to the Virginia Deer of America, pending the outcome of the examination of the issues involved as agreed upon in (2) above, and to request the Secretary to convey this recommendation to specialists when making the consultations referred to in (3) above.

Meigen (J. G.), 1800, " Nouvelle Classification des Mouches à deux Ailes " (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) : (1) Report by the Secretary regarding ; (2) future procedure on, determined

44. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)191, containing the correspondence which since the Session held by the Commission at Lisbon in 1935 had passed between the Secretary to the Commission and specialists in the Order Diptera (Class Insecta) in regard to the generic names in that Order published by Meigen in 1800 in the pamphlet entitled *Nouvelle Classification des Mouches à deux Ailes.* In the same file also were the notes relating to the discovery by the Secretary that the Hendel (1908) transcript of Meigen's diagnoses of the genera established in the *Nouvelle Classification,* on which (owing to the extreme rarity of Meigen's pamphlet) practically every dipterist who had taken part during the last 30 years in discussions on the Meigen (1800) names had had to rely, contained a number of errors, some at least of which were of substance from the point of view of interpreting Meigen's intentions. It was this discovery which had led the Secretary to the Commission to seek the approval of the Council of the Zoological Society of London for the publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* of the *facsimile* reproduction of the fine copy of Meigen's pamphlet possessed by the Society, which appeared in 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.,* **1** : 119–160, together with a covering note by the Secretary to the Commission drawing attention to the discrepancies between Hendel's transcript and the original version, as published by Meigen.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that in its main outlines the problem presented by the Meigen names of 1800 was extremely simple. It was the way in which this problem had been handled by the Commission that was mainly responsible for the present lack of uniformity in the nomenclature of the Order Diptera, though this result had been contributed to also by a certain lack of initiative shown by dipterists themselves, who had not sufficiently realised that in a disputed matter of this kind finality could be achieved only by obtaining from the Commission a definitive decision in regard to each of the names concerned. For over 100 years after its publication, Meigen's *Nouvelle Classification* had been ignored by dipterists, very few of whom had ever seen a copy or were even aware of its existence. In 1908, however, this pamphlet had sprung into the limelight when Hendel had published a transcript of the diagnoses published in it by Meigen and had advanced a claim that these names should be accepted in place of other long-established names published by Meigen himself in 1803. The immediate reception of Hendel's paper was on the whole very critical, but it was not long before it became clear that the Meigen names of 1800 were likely to cause serious disagreement among specialists and consequent confusion in the generic nomenclature of the important Order Diptera. Accordingly, at this stage the late Dr. J. M. Aldrich invited the Commission to give a ruling on the admissibility of these names. The availability of these names could not be impugned on the ground that they had been published without a description, diagnosis or indication, for Meigen had given a concise diagnosis for each of them. Nor could these names be challenged on the ground that Meigen had not cited species by name for the genera which he there established, for there were large numbers of genera in other parts of the Animal Kingdom which had been established in exactly the same way and were universally accepted. The extreme rarity of Meigen's *Nouvelle Classification* had, however, suggested that the names contained in this pamphlet had not been duly published (" divulgués dans une publication ") within the meaning of Article 25 and that possibly therefore those names might be ruled as unavailable on this account. This aspect of the problem had been carefully considered by the Commission who had come to the conclusion that, on the evidence available, this pamphlet must be accepted as having been duly published. The Commission had accordingly adopted an *Opinion* (*Opinion* 28, published in 1910) that the generic names in Meigen's *Nouvelle Classification* must be regarded as available under the *Règles*. In most cases of this kind, such a decision would have cleared the way for the immediate introduction of the names in question and, after the inevitable disturbance had subsided, for the restoration of stability in the nomenclature of the group concerned. This did not happen in the present case, for, apart from the fact that some workers refused to accept the ruling given in *Opinion* 28, many of those who desired to regulate their work in accordance with the *Règles* had found difficulty in so doing owing to the lack of guidance at that time as to the method to be followed in selecting the type species of a genus originally established with no included species cited by name. Not long afterwards, however, this subject was considered by the Commission, and it might therefore have been hoped that difficulties under this head would then have disappeared. Unfortunately, the ambiguous and obscure *Opinion* (*Opinion* 46) rendered by the Commission on this subject, instead of simplifying this problem greatly added to its complexity. As was only to be expected, those workers who wished both to observe the *Règles* and also to avoid using the Meigen names of 1800 were not slow to take advantage of the weaknesses of *Opinion* 46 in arguing against the acceptance of the " Meigen (1800) " names on the ground that it was not possible under that *Opinion* to recognise the originally included species, from which alone the type species could be selected. Discussions on these lines had continued right up to the present time, it being only during the present Session that it had been agreed to simplify and make self-consistent the interpretation of Article 30 given in *Opinion* 46, on that interpretation, as amended, being incorporated into the *Règles*, *Opinion* 46 at the same time being repealed for interpretative purposes. It was largely for the reasons described above that no progress was made during the inter-war years in resolving the difficulties created by the recognition of the availability of the "Meigen (1800)" names. But in part also this lack of progress was due to a projected movement among certain dipterists (mainly in Europe) to seek the suppression of these names by the Commission under their plenary powers. This movement came to a head at the meeting of the International Congress of Entomology held in Paris in 1932. That Congress, however, gave no support to that movement, adopting instead, by a majority, a resolution asking the Commission to give a ruling that the Meigen names of 1800 should now be brought into use. This resolution was considered by the Commission at its Session held at Lisbon in 1935. The Commission had then rightly felt that they could not properly deal with this question in this wholesale way, without any investigation regarding either the validity of the type selections made for the genera concerned, or the weight to be attached to special considerations of other kinds involved in the case of particular names. The Commission had accordingly adopted an *Opinion* (*Opinion* 152) in which they had at the same time reaffirmed their previous decision (*Opinion* 28) that under the *Règles* account must be taken of the Meigen names of 1800 and had invited specialists who were of the opinion that the adoption of any given one of those names would lead to confusion to submit an application, with supporting data, for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to suppress the name in question in favour of the name generally in use. The Commission had hoped that, by this means, it would be possible within a short period to stabilise the nomenclature of the genera concerned. In this hope, the Commission had, however, been disappointed, as the result largely of the continuing difficulties experienced in interpreting *Opinion* 46, the importance of which in this connection they had underestimated when they considered this question at Lisbon. For this reason and also because of the difficulties created by the war, no effective progress had been made since the Lisbon Session of 1935. *Opinion* 152 had, however, elicited two applications: (1) an applica-

(*Previous references: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 39: *12th Meeting, Conclusion* 30)

(*Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion* 15) tion from Dr. John Smart (then of the British Museum (Natural History), London), for the use of the plenary powers to preserve certain generic names which were the type genera of families but which (it was agreed) were due to be sunk in synonymy in favour of corresponding "Meigen (1800)" names, unless the plenary powers were used to prevent this from happening; (2) an application from Dr. C. W. Sabrosky (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) for the suppression of the name *Titania* Meigen, 1800, in favour of the name *Chlorops* Meigen, 1803. The receipt of these applications was an encouraging sign, and he (the Acting President) proposed that these applications should be published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* as soon as might be practicable, with a view to decisions being taken by the Commission thereon with as little further delay as possible. It was essential that the Commission should not allow this question to drift indefinitely through fear of giving offence in one quarter or another (as unfortunately they had for so long done in the case of the generic name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, in the Class Aves). On the other hand, it was extremely important that, short of falling into such delays, the Commission should do everything possible both to ascertain the views of interested specialists and to promote unity among them on the questions at issue. With this end in view, he (the Acting President) had taken advantage of his recent visit to the United States to discuss the Meigen problem with interested specialists and since his return he had held similar discussions with specialists in Europe, in the hope of devising some agreed formula which could be applied in determining whether a given "Meigen (1800)" name should be accepted or on the contrary rejected under the plenary powers. He was bound to report that no results of practical value had so far emerged from these discussions.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusion* 8)

Continuing, the Acting President said that he had come to the conclusion that the proper course for the Commission now to adopt would be to take decisions as promptly as possible on applications submitted in accordance with *Opinion* 152. In each case, they should take steps to ascertain the extent to which the "Meigen (1800)" name in question was already in current use (in the sense which would result from the assumption that the first species selected as the type species was, in fact, the type species), and the degree of disturbance, if any, which the general acceptance of that name would involve. Having done so, the Commission should, he recommended, either decide in favour of the adoption of the "Meigen (1800)" name concerned (by formally rejecting a proposal for its suppression) or should use their plenary powers either to vary the type species of the genus so named or to suppress that name in favour of the corresponding Meigen name of 1803. In each case the decision taken should depend upon the action necessary, in the opinion of the Commission, to avoid confusion and promote stability. Every name so accepted, either with or without resort to the plenary powers, should then be placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology," the corresponding rejected name being at the same time placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology." Prompt decisions on applications submitted under *Opinion* 152 would settle once and for all the question whether the "Meigen (1800)" name concerned should be the correct name for the genus in question, and the decision reached, whatever its nature, would stabilise the name to be applied thereafter to that genus. The Commission, he recommended, should begin by dealing as promptly as possible with the applications already received from Dr. Smart and Dr. Sabrosky. In addition, they should do everything in their power to promote the submission of further proposals. With this end in view, he proposed, as Chairman of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature of the Royal Entomological Society of London, to recommend the Diptera Sub-Committee of that Committee (the work of which had been brought to a virtual standstill through doubts regarding the status to be accorded to the relevant "Meigen (1800)" names) to ask the Society to seek rulings from the Commission on each of the Meigen names which affected the British List. He was hopeful that, once some degree of progress had been made on these lines, specialists interested in securing stability in the generic nomenclature of other groups in the Order Diptera would be attracted to submit further similar applications, until eventually the names of all the genera concerned had been stabilised through being placed on the "Official List."

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) said that, from his contacts with specialists, he was satisfied that there was today a much greater desire than ever before among dipterists, especially among the younger workers, to see an end put to the fruitless controversy which for over 30 years had done so much harm to the nomenclature of this Order. There was also a much greater willingness to sink individual preferences in the interests of the general good. He considered, therefore, that the Secretary should be encouraged to continue his efforts to promote a solution of this difficult problem. He was in agreement with the specific proposals in regard to procedure submitted by the Secretary.

IN FURTHER DISCUSSION, the view was expressed that the way in which this case had in the past been handled had been unfortunate, and, in particular, that the defects in *Opinion* 46 (which it had now, at last, been agreed to remedy) had contributed materially to prolong the difficulties created by the "Meigen (1800)" names. In its turn, the delay which had occurred had materially affected the nature of the issues involved, for names which could with advantage have been suppressed under the plenary powers, if those powers had been invoked as soon as they had been granted to the Commission, had since been widely, though by no means unanimously, used both in systematic and technical literature and in routine identifications by entomological institutions, with the result that any application for the use of the plenary powers to suppress those names would today present features which would have been absent if a corresponding application had been made 30 years earlier. It was generally agreed that, as suggested by the Secretary in his Report, the Commission should direct their efforts to securing decisions on the names to be applied to individual genera affected by the Meigen controversy, that method offering much greater prospect of success than any more general approach to the problem. As the Commission gradually succeeded in this task, they would, it might be hoped, succeed at the same time in restoring the uniformity in nomenclatorial practice which a generation earlier had been so severely impaired by the discovery of Meigen's *Nouvelle Classification.*

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note of the Report submitted by the Secretary to the Commission on the discussions which had taken place since their Session held at Lisbon in 1935, for the purpose of devising means for stabilising that part of the generic nomenclature of the Order Diptera (Class Insecta) which had been thrown into confusion as the result of the controversy which had arisen consequent upon the publication in 1908 of the paper in which Hendel had claimed to have recognised the genera for which diagnoses had been published by Meigen in 1800 in the pamphlet entitled *Nouvelle Classification des Mouches à deux Ailes;*

(2) agreed :—

(a) to take all practicable steps to promote the submission to the Commission of applications under the provisions of *Opinion* 152 regarding individual Meigen (1800) names which specialists desired either should be placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " or should be suppressed by the Commission under their plenary powers ;

(b) to reach decisions as rapidly as possible on all applications submitted in accordance with (a) above, on the basis of all available information relating to the degree of confusion to which the stabilisation or, as the case might be, the suppression of the Meigen (1800) names concerned would be likely to give rise, and, in particular, of data regarding the relative use (i) in systematic literature, (ii) in the literature of applied biology, and (iii) in routine identifications carried out by entomological institutions, of the Meigen (1800) names in question and the corresponding Meigen (1803) or other names, in successive recent periods, the plenary powers being used or withheld according to which course appeared likely to cause the least confusion and disturbance in current nomenclature ;

(c) where, in response to an application submitted in accordance with (a) above, the plenary powers were used to suppress a Meigen (1800) name, to place that name forthwith on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology," and at the same time to place on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " whichever name (whether a Meigen (1803) or another) became thereby the oldest available name for, and therefore the valid name of, the genus concerned ;

(d) where, in response to an application submitted in accordance with (a) above, the Commission refused to use its plenary powers to suppress a Meigen (1800) name, to place the name concerned on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology," at the same time placing on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " the name, the application for the validation of which under the plenary powers had been refused.

Individual problems of zoological nomenclature on which decisions had been taken during the present (14th) Meeting of the Commission: Report on, to be submitted to the Section on Nomenclature

45. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, now that the Commission had examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)191 (relating to the discussions in regard to the problem of the generic names in the Order Diptera (Class Insecta), published by Meigen in 1800, which had taken place since this matter had been considered by the Commission at Lisbon in 1935), they had completed the examination of all the Commission Files which he had brought with him to Paris for their consideration, with the exception of Commission File Z.N.(S.)143 (relating to certain serious errors in *Opinion* 104 in regard to the nomenclature of the human malaria parasites), which he proposed to bring before the Commission a little later during the present meeting. The present, therefore, seemed an appropriate moment at which to report to the Section on Nomenclature the decisions taken by the Commission during the present meeting in regard both to the individual nomenclatorial problems, the applications relating to which had been published in Parts 10 and 11 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, and also to the similar cases dealt with in the Commission files which the Commission had just examined. As the present meeting of the Commission was being held jointly with a meeting of the Section and the decisions taken by the Commission on all the individual cases in question had been taken unanimously by the Commission in full agreement with the other members of the Section present, the Report now to be submitted would be purely formal. Nevertheless, such a Report should be submitted, in order that it might be on record that the cases in question had been submitted by the Commission to the Section for their approval.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to report to the Section on Nomenclature the decisions reached on the undermentioned individual problems of zoological nomenclature and to seek the approval of the Section therefor :—

  (a) the problems dealt with in the applications published in Parts 10 and 11 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (Conclusions 2–12 and 14–21) ;

  (b) the problems dealt with in the Commission Files examined by the Commission (Conclusions 23–44) ;

(2) to invite the Acting President, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, forthwith to submit to the Section on Nomenclature the Report referred to in (1) above.

(*The Acting President thereupon submitted the foregoing Report to the Section on Nomenclature.*)

Reissues of "Opinions" 1-16: examination (1) of comments on interpretations of the "Règles" given in, and (2) of certain proposals for further action submitted either in "Editorial Notes" attached to, or in footnotes added to

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 9)

46. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) proposed that the Commission should now turn their attention to the commentaries on certain of the earlier *Opinions* contained in "Editorial Notes" written by himself as Secretary to the Commission at the time when those *Opinions* (which had long been out of print and in consequence were virtually unobtainable) had been republished in Volume 1 of the work entitled "Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature." As the Commission would recall, he (the Acting President) had already referred to these "Editorial Notes" when they had had under consideration the proposals for the codification of the interpretations of the *Règles* given in *Opinions* which had been submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)10. For the reasons explained, these "Editorial Notes" had been a step in the right direction, but, as he had then observed, they inevitably suffered from the disadvantage that, however obvious the points made in them in any given case, the points so made were points made by a single individual and lacked therefore the value which they would command if they had been issued as the considered views of the Commission as a body. As he had pointed out, the codification of the interpretation of the *Règles* as recommended in Paper I.C.(48)10 would render such "Editorial Notes" unnecessary, for, after codification, the *Opinions* themselves would cease to have any but a historical value and it would be not only unnecessary but positively wrong in future to look to these *Opinions* for guidance as to the interpretation of the *Règles*. The comments in the "Editorial Notes" attached to the reissues of the *Opinions* in question were of two kinds: first, there were notes concerned with the interpretation of the *Règles* given in the *Opinions* concerned; second, there were notes containing proposals for further action by the Commission in regard to individual nomenclatorial questions either dealt with directly in the *Opinions* in questions or arising in connection with the discussion of those *Opinions*. The decisions taken by the Commission during the present Session for the codification of the interpretations of the *Règles* given in these *Opinions* covered all the points relating to matters of interpretation raised in these "Editorial Notes" with the exception of that raised in Note 5 to the reissue of *Opinion* 4, which was concerned with the scope of the ruling given in that *Opinion* in regard to the status of names which, prior to being published, had existed only as manuscript names. One of the questions relating to individual nomenclatorial questions raised in these "Editorial Notes" (the question of the type species of *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758) had also been settled by the Commission during the present Session. The Acting President proposed that the Commission should now examine the question of interpretation raised in Note 5 to *Opinion* 4 and that, having done so, they should consider those of the "Editorial Notes" relating to individual nomenclatorial questions which had not already been considered during the present Session. He suggested that included among these questions should be the problem of the status of names published in 1758 in the *Geslachten der Vogelen* of Nozeman and Vosmaer, reports on which by President Karl Jordan had been reproduced in a footnote to the reissue of *Opinion* 5.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to examine, in turn, the undermentioned questions raised either in "Editorial Notes" attached to, or in footnotes inserted in, the reissues of *Opinions* 1–16 (1944–1947, *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*, **1** : 73–304), with a view to reaching decisions on the questions so raised :—

(a) Note 5 to the reissue of *Opinion* 4 on the subject of the scope of the decision in that *Opinion* in regard to the status of names which, prior to being published, existed only as manuscript names ;

(b) Footnote 10 to the reissue of *Opinion* 5, containing Reports prepared by President Karl Jordan on the question of the availability of names as published in 1758 in the *Geslachten der Vogelen* of Nozeman and Vosmaer ;

(c) Notes 3 and 5–8 to the reissue of *Opinion* 13, containing recommendations for the adoption of :—

  (i) an *Opinion* on the availability of names in the edition of Mark Catesby's *Natural History of Carolina* edited by George Edwards and published in 1771 ;

  (ii) an *Opinion* on the availability of names published in 1778 in Meuschen's *Museum Gronovianum;*

  (iii) an *Opinion* relating to the trivial name of the Sand Crab, correcting the errors in *Opinion* 13 and cancelling that *Opinion;*

(d) Notes 3–5 to the reissue of *Opinion* 16 regarding certain generic names discussed in that *Opinion* but on which the Commission then gave no ruling as to the species severally to be accepted as the type species of the genera concerned ;

(e) Note 7 attached to the reissue of *Opinion* 16 on the need for the use of the Commission's plenary powers to validate the entry in the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " of *Taenia solium* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Taenia* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Cestoidea), made under the authority of *Opinion* 84, notwithstanding the fact that, as pointed out in *Opinion* 16, the type species of that genus under the *Règles* was *Taenia vulgaris* Linnaeus, 1758, by absolute tautonymy.

Article 25 : question whether, when an author, on publishing a manuscript name or republishing with an indication a name previously published as a " nomen nudum ", omits expressly to state that he is so doing, that omission is material to the status of the name so published or republished, clarification of position regarding

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 18)

47. THE COMMISSION examined Note 5 attached to the reissue in 1944 of *Opinion* 4 (relating to the status of names published as manuscript names), in which the Secretary to the Commission had drawn attention to the fact that, although the title of that *Opinion* (" The status of names published as manuscript names ") suggested that the decision there given applied only to those cases in which an author, when publishing a name, expressly stated that that name was a manuscript name, it was clear from the form of words employed in the " summary " of that *Opinion* (" Manuscript names acquire standing in nomenclature when printed in connection with the provisions of Article 25 . . . ") that in fact the ruling in that *Opinion* applied to all manuscript names when published with an indication, definition or description by a binominal author, irrespective of whether or not that author expressly stated that the name which he is publishing is a manuscript name.

In discussion it was generally agreed that it was desirable that in the provision which it had been agreed (at the meeting noted in the margin) should be inserted in the *Règles* to give effect (in a suitably corrected form) to the interpretation of Article 25 given in *Opinion* 4 words should be inserted to make it clear that it was immaterial for the purposes of that provision whether an author who published a name which had previously existed only as a manuscript name expressly stated or not that he was so doing. It was desirable also that it should be made clear that the same principle applied in cases where an author published with an indication, definition or description a name previously published as a *nomen nudum*. It was pointed out that in the older literature it frequently happened that a manuscript name, when published, was attributed by the author by whom it was published to the author by whom it had been originally proposed in manuscript, either because he was not aware that in fact that name had never been published by its original author or out of a mistaken idea that, by so doing, it might be possible to link that author's name with the name in question, now that it had at last been published. Similarly, some authors, when republishing with an indication, definition or description a name which had previously been published as a *nomen nudum*, attributed the name in question to the author by whom it had previously been published as a *nomen nudum*. It would be well that the decision now to be taken should apply to such cases also.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted in the provision which, on the recommendation of the Commission (at the 6th Meeting (Conclusion 18) of their Paris Session), it had now been agreed to insert in Article 25 of the *Règles* to give effect to the decision embodied in *Opinion* 4, making it clear that it was immaterial for the purpose of that provision whether an author, when publishing a manuscript name or republishing with an indication (including the citation of the name in question in the synonymy of a species or subspecies having a validly published name), definition or description a name previously published only as a *nomen nudum*, expressly states that he is so doing or whether an author publishing or, as the case may be, republishing, such a name attributes that name to some previous author in the erroneous belief that that name had been validly published by that author or as a tribute to the author by whom the name in question had been originally proposed either in manuscript or published as a *nomen nudum*.

Article 25 : publication of names which had previously existed as manuscript names and the republication of names previously published only as "nomina nuda," addition of a "Recommandation" condemning

48. In the course of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 47 above, the view was expressed that the publication of names which had previously existed only as manuscript names and of names which had previously been published only as *nomina nuda* was calculated to cause confusion and should therefore be avoided, save in exceptional circumstances where there existed some special reason which made the publication of such a name desirable.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to recommend that a *Recommandation* should be inserted in Article 25 of the *Règles* strongly condemning (a) the publication of names which

had previously existed only as manuscript names and (b) the republication of names which had previously been given an irregular currency through having been published as *nomina nuda*, and urging any author who might consider that for some special reason it was important that such a name should be published or, as the case may be republished, expressly to draw attention to the action which he was taking ;

(2) to invite the Acting President, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, forthwith to report to the Section on Nomenclature the recommendation specified in (1) above, together with the recommendation for the clarification of the provisions in the *Règles* in relation to the status of names which, prior to being published, had existed only as manuscript names, and of names which, prior to being published with an indication, definition or description, had previously been published as *nomina nuda*, recorded in Conclusion 47 above.

(*The Acting President thereupon submitted the foregoing recommendations to the Section on Nomenclature.*)

Article 21 : authorship of names and the method to be adopted in citing authors' names : supplementary provisions adopted regarding

49. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that at their meeting held on the evening of Friday, 23rd July, 1948, the Commission had made a survey of the position as regards the 17 applications submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (University of Toulouse, France) and had agreed, as regards those of the proposals in question on which decisions had not at that time been taken, that certain of those proposals should be considered at a later meeting during the present Session, with a view to decisions being taken thereon, while others should be remitted for further study after the close of the present Session. The Commission had now taken decisions on all the applications in question which it had then been agreed should be dealt with during the present Session, with the exception of Professor Bonnet's Proposition 13, which he accordingly now invited the Commission to consider. In this proposition Professor Bonnet had recommended that words should be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing the criteria to be adopted in determining the authorship of a new name published in a joint paper by two or more authors, in those cases where it was clearly stated in the paper that the description of the taxonomic unit to which a given new name was applied was the exclusive work of one only of the authors concerned.

Professor Bonnet had proposed that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing that in a case such as that indicated above, where a paper was the joint product of two authors (authors " A " and " B ") and the paper contained clear evidence that the description of all or of certain specified taxonomic units there named for the first time was the exclusive work of one only of the authors concerned (say author " B ") the name or names in question were to be attributed to author " B " (and not to authors " A " and " B " jointly) and were to be cited as having been named by author " B " " *in* ' A ' and ' B '," this attribution being followed in the ordinary way by the title of the joint book in which the name in question appeared or, as the case might be, the title of the serial in which the joint paper containing that name was published. Similarly, where the author of a book or paper (say author " A ") expressly states that the description of a taxonomic unit named therein for the first time was written by some other author (say author " C "), the name in question should be attributed to author " C ", not to author " A ", and should be cited as having been published by " ' C ' *in* ' A '."

In discussion, it was agreed that it would be helpful if there were added to the *Règles* a provision such as that suggested by Professor Bonnet, for it would serve the useful purpose of giving formal recognition to the best current practice in this matter.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to recommend that the following provisions should be added to Article 21 prescribing the method to be followed (i) in determining the authorship to be attributed to a name published in a book or paper written jointly by two or more authors and to a name published by one author in a book or paper written by another author, and (ii) in citing names so published :—

(a) Where in a book or paper written jointly by two or more authors, it is clearly stated that one of those authors is exclusively responsible for the description of one or more specified taxonomic units there named, the name or names so published are to be attributed solely to the author stated to be responsible for the descriptions thereof and not jointly to both or all of the joint authors of the book or paper. The name of a taxonomic unit so described and named by an author " B " in a paper written jointly by himself and one or more other authors (say, a paper written jointly by authors " A " and " B ") is to be cited as having been published by " ' B ' *in* ' A ' and ' B ' "

(b) Where in a book or paper written by one author (say author " A ") it is clearly stated that the description of one or more specified taxonomic units there named has been prepared exclusively by some other author (say, author " C "), the name or names in question are to be attributed to author " C," not to author " A." The name of a taxonomic unit so described and named is to be cited by later authors as having been published by " ' C ' *in* ' A '."

(2) to invite the Acting President, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, to report forthwith to the Section on Nomenclature the recommendation recorded in (1) above.

(*The Acting President thereupon submitted the foregoing recommendations to the Section on Nomenclature.*)

Nozeman & Vosmaer, 1758, " Geslachten der Vogelen " (a translation into Dutch of a work by Moehring entitled " Avium Genera " published in 1752) : declared not available for nomenclatorial purposes

50. THE COMMISSION examined Footnote 10 to Note 4 of the " Editorial Notes " attached to the reissue in 1944 of *Opinion* 5 relating to the status of names originally published prior to 1758 (the starting-point of zoological nomenclature), when republished by a binominal author subsequent to 1757 (*Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* **1** : 121–122), containing two Reports by President Karl Jordan (United Kingdom) on the question of the availability of generic names published in 1758 by Nozeman and Vosmaer in a translation, entitled *Geslachten der Vogelen* of a work by P. H. G. Moehring entitled *Avium Genera* which had been published in 1752 (i.e. prior to the starting point of zoological nomenclature, as defined by Article 26) (file Z.N.(S.)367, formerly file Z.N.(G.)24). President Jordan had shown in his Reports, which were illustrated by quotations from the *Geslachten* of Nozeman and Vosmaer and contained also a comparison of that work with the *Avium Genera* of Moehring, that in their *Geslachten* Nozemann and Vosmaer had not re-inforced, by adoption or acceptance, the generic names published by Moehring in 1752. These names, as published by Nozeman and Vosmaer thus failed to satisfy the requirements laid down in the Commission's *Opinion* 5, and hence possessed no status under the *Règles*, as from the date of being so published.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) explained that the question of the availability of generic names as published by Nozeman and Vosmaer in 1758 had arisen when, as Secretary to the Commission, he (the Acting President) had been engaged in the preparation of the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" for publication in book form. For when he had examined from this point of view the entries on the "Official List" in regard to the generic names *Coturnix* Bonnaterre, 1790, and *Grus* Pallas, 1766 (placed on the "Official List" in *Opinions* 67 and 103 respectively), he had found that, if Nozeman and Vosmaer's *Geslachten der Vogelen* was an available work, each of the above generic names was an invalid homonym of a generic name published by Nozeman and Vosmaer. On being consulted, President Jordan had kindly agreed to make a critical examination of Nozeman and Vosmaer's *Geslachten*, with special reference to the question whether generic names published therein satisfied the tests laid down in *Opinion* 5 for the acceptance of pre-1758 names, when re-published by a binominal author after 1757. It was evident from the Reports furnished by President Jordan that Nozeman and Vosmaer's *Geslachten der Vogelen* did not fulfil the requirements laid down in *Opinion* 5 and therefore that new names published in that work possessed no status under the *Règles* as from the date of being so published.

Continuing, the Acting President said that, during the war, he had had correspondence with Vice-President James L. Peters (U.S.A.), who, as an ornithologist, was anxious to be assured that the so-called generic names of Nozeman and Vosmaer were not available under the *Règles;* Dr. Peters explained that he had been informed by the late Commissioner L. Stejneger (U.S.A.) that the status of these names had already on a previous occasion formed the subject of consideration by the Commission. It might well be, the Acting President considered, that the late Commissioner Stejneger's recollection in this matter was correct, for he had been famed for his accurate and retentive memory. If so, this must have been one of the cases which in the past the Commission had at some time taken up, but on which they had never reached a decision. The generic names which appeared in Nozeman and Vosmaer's *Geslachten* were not currently accepted by ornithologists, but they none-the-less constituted a potential cause of confusion and instability in ornithological nomenclature so long as there was no definite ruling by the Commission that they were to be rejected as possessing no status in zoological nomenclature as from the date of their having been so published. He (the Acting President) accordingly recommended that the Commission should now dispose of this problem by giving such a ruling.

IN DISCUSSION there was general agreement that President Jordan had clearly established that the *Geslachten der Vogelen* of Nozeman and Vosmaer (1758) did not satisfy the requirements of *Opinion* 5 and therefore that names, as published in that work, possessed no status under the *Règles*. The action proposed met therefore with general approval.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the work published in 1758 under the title *Geslachten der Vogelen*, consisting of a translation into Dutch by Nozeman and Vosmaer of the work entitled *Avium Genera* by Moehring (P.N.G.) originally published in 1752 (i.e. before the starting-point of zoological nomenclature, as prescribed by Article 26) was not available under the *Règles*, Nozeman and Vosmaer not having reinforced the names contained therein by adoption or acceptance in the manner prescribed in *Opinion* 5, and therefore that those names possessed no status in zoological nomenclature as from the date of being so published ;

(2) to render an *Opinion* recording the decision specified in (1) above.

Edwards' edition (1771) of Catesby (M), " Natural History of Carolina " (status of names in) : clarification of decision in " Opinion " 89 relating to

51. THE COMMISSION examined Notes 3 and 8 of the " Editorial Notes " attached to the reissue in 1947 of *Opinion* 13 containing a recommendation that, when (as there proposed) *Opinion* 13 was replaced by an amending *Opinion*, a separate *Opinion* should be rendered in regard to the status of names appearing in the edition of Mark Catesby's *Natural History of Carolina*, edited by George Edwards and published in 1771 (Hemming, 1947, in *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* **1** : 213–215, 227–232). In this note the Secretary to the Commission had pointed out that implicit in the decision given in *Opinion* 13 (regarding the trivial name of the Sand Crab) was a decision on a matter of general interest which should logically have been stated in express terms and embodied in a separate *Opinion*. The decision in question was that Catesby's names were not reinforced by adoption or acceptance when his *Natural History of Carolina* was edited and republished by George Edwards, and, in consequence, that these names, so republished, did not thereby acquire any status under the

Règles. Fifteen years after the publication in 1910 of *Opinion* 13 the late Commissioner David Starr Jordan (U.S.A.) had proposed that the plenary powers should be used to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes a number of early books, one of which was the Edwards edition (1771) of Catesby's *Natural History of Carolina.* The proposals so submitted were approved by the Commission on general grounds and without any detailed examination of the nomenclatorial status of the individual books in question. In their *Opinion* on this subject (*Opinion* 89), the Commission added after the words " Under suspension of the rules " the qualifying words " in any case where such suspension may be considered necessary according to the interpretation now or hereafter adopted by the Commission," thus showing that, as regards some at least of the books suppressed for nomenclatorial purposes under the plenary powers in that *Opinion*, they entertained some doubt as to the need for the action so taken. As noted above, that action was entirely unnecessary in the case of the Edwards edition of Catesby's *Natural History of Carolina*, for already in 1910 (in *Opinion* 13) the Commission had taken the stand that the names used by Catesby in the original edition of the foregoing work published in the period 1731–1743 did not acquire status under the *Règles* in virtue of having been republished after the starting-point of zoological nomenclature in the edition prepared by Edwards and published in 1771. Thus, not even the conditional use in *Opinion* 89 of the plenary powers in regard to the Edwards edition of Catesby's work was called for. As was well known, the use of the plenary powers at that time was confined to cases where there was absolute unanimity in the Commission in favour of such action. It appeared from the particulars of the voting on this case recorded at the close of *Opinion* 89 (published in 1925, *Smithson. misc. Coll.* **73** (No. 3) : 32–33) that, in voting in favour of the proposed *Opinion*, the late Commissioner L. Stejneger (U.S.A.) had done so subject to the express proviso that the proposed use of the plenary power was not to apply to the concordance prepared by Edwards, in which the equivalent Linnean names were given, which was appended to Volume 2 of the Edwards edition under the title " A Catalogue of the Animals and Plants represented in Catesby's *Natural History of Carolina:* With the Linnaean Names." In a note added by the then Secretary to the Commission (: 33) in regard to Commissioner Stejneger's reservation, that Officer had written : " Commissioner Stejneger's reservation is interpreted by the Secretary as limiting the unanimous vote of the Commission in the case of Catesby 1771 so that the suspension does not include the concordance." This interpretation of the effect of Commissioner Stejneger's reservation was undoubtedly correct, but unfortunately it had not been recorded in the " summary " of *Opinion* 89, recording the decision taken on Commissioner D. S. Jordan's application, with the result that the limitation imposed on the action then taken in regard to the Edwards edition of Catesby's book had been frequently overlooked. At the close of the " Editorial Notes " to *Opinion* 13 now under consideration by the Commission, the present Secretary had suggested that, as part of the decision to cancel *Opinion* 13 (as there recommended) and to replace it by an *Opinion* setting out the correct position in regard to the name of the Sand Crab, the Commission should render an *Opinion* also setting out the decision in regard to the Edwards edition of Catesby's book implicitly laid down in *Opinion* 13. The juridical position as regards the names published in that book would thus be unaffected by the cancellation of *Opinion* 13.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, since the time when, as Secretary to the Commission, he had prepared for the consideration of the Commission the " Editorial Notes " now under examination, he had come to the conclusion that, in view of the decision taken by the Commission in *Opinion* 89 to use their plenary powers to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes names used by Catesby in his pre-1758 *Natural History of Carolina*, as republished by Edwards in 1771, the position, as it had existed before that decision, had become a matter of academic interest only, and therefore that there was no need now for the Commission to render an *Opinion* restating the decision on this subject given implicitly in *Opinion* 13. It was desirable, however, in his view, that the Commission should render an *Opinion* clarifying the decision in regard to the Edwards (1771) edition of Catesby's book given in *Opinion* 89, for it was misleading in the highest degree that there should be no express mention in that decision of the material limitation imposed thereon by the reservation attached to Commissioner Stejneger's vote. It was essential that by one means or another such a clarification should be made before the decision in that *Opinion* was recorded in the Schedule which (as agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin) was now to be added to the *Règles* recording decisions taken by the Commission under their plenary powers.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusions* 3 (3) (a) (ii))

IN DISCUSSION, it was generally agreed that it was necessary that the decision in *Opinion* 89 should be clarified in the manner proposed.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to render an *Opinion*, supplementary to *Opinion* 89, making it clear :—

(a) that the decision taken in *Opinion* 89 to use the plenary powers, in so far as that might be necessary, to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes the names which appeared in the edition of Mark Catesby's pre-1758 work *The Natural History of Carolina*, edited by George Edwards and published in 1771, did not apply to the names employed in accordance with the Linnean system in the concordance of the Linnean nomenclature of the species concerned with the nomenclature used therefor by Catesby in the original edition of the foregoing work, given by Edwards in Volume 2 of the edition issued in 1771 under the title " A Catalogue of the Animals and Plants represented in Catesby's *Natural History of Carolina:* With the Linnean Names " ;

(b) that, in view of (a) above, the names employed by Edwards in accordance with the Linnean system in the concordance referred to above, but not the names used by Catesby in the original pre-1758 edition of *The Natural History of Carolina* given in a second column in the same concordance, were available under the *Règles* as from 1771, the year in which the volume containing Edwards' concordance was published.

Meuschen (F.C.), 1778, " Museum Gronovianum " : declared not available for nomenclatorial purposes

52. THE COMMISSION examined :—

(a) Note 7 of the " Editorial Notes " by the Secretary to the Commission attached to the reissue in 1947 of *Opinion* 13 relating to the trivial name of the Sand Crab (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), on the subject of the status to be accorded to names as published in 1778 in the *Museum Gronovianum* of Meuschen (F.C.) (Hemming, 1947, in *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* **1** : 219–227, 2 pls.) ;

(b) the concluding portion of Note 8 attached to the foregoing reissue of *Opinion* 13, containing a recommendation submitted by the Secretary to the Commission that the Commission should give a ruling that Meuschen's *Museum Gronovianum* was not available for nomenclatorial purposes (Hemming, 1947, in *ibid.* **1** : 231).

In the first of the foregoing notes, Secretary Hemming had recalled that one of the assumptions adopted by the late Miss Mary J. Rathbun (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) in her application for a ruling by the Commission on the question of the oldest available trivial name for the Sand Crab (dealt with in *Opinion* 13) had been that the trivial name *quadratus* Fabricius, 1793 (as published in the binominal combination *Cancer quadratus*) was not available for the Sand Crab, owing to its being a primary homonym of another trivial name *quadratus*, also originally published in the binominal combination *Cancer quadratus*. Two points had to be noted at this stage : (i) the name *Cancer quadratus* had been first given to the Sand Crab, not in 1793 (*Ent. Syst.*) (as stated in Miss Rathbun's application to the Commission) but in 1787 (in the first volume of the *Mantissa Insectorum*) ; (ii) Miss Rathbun had not indicated the place of publication of the earlier binominal combination *Cancer quadratus*, which, in her view, rendered invalid that name as applied by Fabricius to the Sand Crab. In examining the issues involved in *Opinion* 13, the Secretary to the Commission had had therefore to ascertain whether, and if so where, the name *Cancer quadratus* had been published, either for the same or some other species, prior to the publication of the name *Cancer quadratus* Fabricius, 1787. Investigation had shown that the only place where such a name had been published was in Meuschen's *Museum Gronovianum*, issued in 1778. An examination of a copy of that very rare book had shown that it was a sale catalogue of the collection formed by Gronovius. Further, that examination had shown that the *Museum Gronovianum* had been printed for use by special persons only (*i.e.* by prospective purchasers of items in Gronovius' collection), that it had been printed for a special occasion only (*i.e.* for use at the sale of the foregoing collection) and that it had not been prepared by Meuschen as a document to be used in the nature of a permanent scientific record. Thus, the *Museum Gronovianum* of Meuschen failed to satisfy any of the tests laid down in *Opinion* 51 as constituting the criteria to be adopted in deciding whether a given work had been duly published as required by Article 25. It followed, therefore, that Meuschen's *Museum Gronovianum* was not available under the *Règles* for nomenclatorial purposes, and that no name which first appeared in it acquired any status under the *Règles* as the result of having so appeared. Secretary Hemming had recommended that, in order to obviate any further misunderstandings regarding the status of names in

Meuschen's *Museum Gronovianum*, the Commission should give a ruling in the sense indicated above.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, in view of the decision taken during the present Session that the expression " nomenclature binaire " as used up till then in the *Règles* had a meaning identical with the expression " nomenclature binominale " (by which it was now to be replaced), it was evident from this point of view also that the *Museum Gronovianum* of Meuschen failed to satisfy the requirements of the *Règles* and must therefore be rejected for nomenclatorial purposes.

IT WAS GENERALLY AGREED in discussion that the reproduction in *facsimile* of pages of the *Museum Gronovianum* contained in Secretary Hemming's paper on this subject made it absolutely clear that in that work Meuschen had not applied the principles of binominal nomenclature (as required by Proviso (b) to Article 25) and therefore that the above work was not available under the *Règles*. It was evident also that it had never been published in the sense of Article 25 and that for this reason also the *Museum Gronovianum* was not an available work, and that names, as appearing in it, possessed no status in zoological nomenclature.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the work by Meuschen (F. C.) issued in 1788 under the title *Museum Gronovianum*, was not available for nomenclatorial purposes under the *Règles* (a) because (by having been printed for special persons only and for a special occasion only, and not having been issued as a document to be used in the nature of a permanent scientific record) it could not be regarded as having been duly published within the meaning of Article 25, and (b) because in this work Meuschen had not applied the principles of binominal nomenclature, as prescribed in Proviso (b) to the aforesaid Article, and therefore no name acquired any rights under the *Règles* by reason of having appeared in the above work ;

(2) to render an *Opinion* recording the decision specified in (1) above.

Sand Crab (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda) : (1) the trivial name " quadratus " Fabricius, 1787 (as published in the

53. THE COMMISSION examined Notes 5 to 8 attached to the reissue in 1947 of *Opinion* 13 (relating to the trivial name of the Sand Crab), in which the Secretary to the Commission drew attention to certain defects in the foregoing *Opinion* and recommended that it should be

binominal combination " Cancer quadratus ") the oldest available trivial name for ; (2) " Opinion " 13 to be cancelled as incorrect ; (3) a revised " Opinion " to be rendered when views of specialists have been obtained on action desirable

replaced by a new *Opinion* based upon the additional information now available (Hemming, 1947, in *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* **1** : 216–232, 2 pls.). In these notes Secretary Hemming had drawn attention to the following considerations : (i) the statement that the trivial name *arenarius* as published by Edwards in 1771 in the binominal combination *Cancer arenarius*, was (for the reasons there given) not available for the Sand Crab, was incomplete and misleading, for even if the reasons given in *Opinion* 13 had not been applicable, the name *Cancer arenarius* Edwards, 1771, would nevertheless have been invalid, that name being a junior primary homonym of the name *Cancer arenarius* Toreen, 1765, a name which had been given to an entirely different species ; (ii) the trivial name *quadratus* Fabricius (as published in the binominal combination *Cancer quadratus*), the next trivial name to be given to the Sand Crab, had been first published in 1787 (in volume 1 of the *Mantissa Insectorum*), not (as stated in *Opinion* 13) in 1793 (i.e. in the *Entomologia systematica*) ; (iii) the statement in *Opinion* 13 that the trivial name *quadratus* Fabricius (as published in the binominal combination *Cancer quadratus*) was invalid on the ground that it was a junior primary homonym of another trivial name *quadratus* (also published in the binominal combination *Cancer quadratus*) was incorrect, for the only previous occasion on which this trivial name had appeared in print in the foregoing binominal combination was in 1778 in Meuschen's *Museum Gronovianum*, a work which did not satisfy the requirements of Article 25, appearance in which therefore conferred no status on any name not previously published. It appeared from the foregoing considerations that, contrary to the statement contained in *Opinion* 13, the trivial name *quadratus* Fabricius (as published in the binominal combination *Cancer quadratus* and attributed not to the *Ent. syst.* (1793) but to the *Mant. Ins.* (1787)) was an available name and, as the oldest available name for the Sand Crab, should be used for that species. It remained true that, on the premises adopted by the Commission in *Opinion* 13, the oldest available trivial name for the Sand Crab was *albicans*, Bosc, [1801–1802] (as published in the binominal combination *Ocypoda albicans*), but, in view of the fact that (as was now apparent) the premises on which that conclusion was based were faulty, the statement in this *Opinion* that *albicans* Bosc was the oldest available trivial name for the Sand Crab was totally misleading as a guide to practical action. Secretary Hemming had accordingly recommended that *Opinion* 13 should be replaced as soon as possible by a

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion 52*) revised *Opinion*, stating that, for the reasons explained above, the oldest available trivial name for the Sand Crab was *quadratus* Fabricius, 1787 (as published in the binominal combination *Cancer quadratus*).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had received two communications in regard to this application : the first, from Dr. I. Gordon (British Museum (Natural History), London), the second, from Dr. Fenner A. Chace, Jr. (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.). Dr. Gordon had stated that she was in agreement both with the line of argument adopted in the application as set out in Notes 5 to 8 of the " Editorial Notes " attached to the re-issue of *Opinion* 13, and with the action there recommended to the Commission for approval. Dr. Fenner Chace, while reporting that some zoologists in America were already giving effect in their work to the recommendations now before the Commission, had suggested that, before those proposals were approved, the Commission should consider also the question of the availability of names published by Meuschen in the index to the *Zoophylacium Gronovianum* of Gronovius which had been published in 1781, for that index contained the trivial name *quadratus* (in connection with the generic name *Cancer*). If, therefore, the index of the *Zoophylacium* was held to be an available work for nomenclatorial purposes, the name *Cancer quadratus* Fabricius, 1787, for the Sand Crab would be a homonym of *Cancer quadratus* Meuschen, 1781, and in consequence the trivial name *quadratus* would not be available for the Sand Crab, unless it were found that it was to that species also that Meuschen had applied that name in 1781. In that case the name *quadratus* would still be the oldest available name for the Sand Crab, but would have to be attributed not to Fabricius, 1787, but to Meuschen, 1781. As he (the Acting President) had explained earlier during the present meeting, the question of the availability of the names published in the index to the *Zoophylacium* had been studied by himself before the war in connection with his review of the older literature relating to the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta). He had then formed the conclusion that the author of that index could not be regarded as a binominal author, though he was what was then commonly called a " binary author " ; in consequence this was not a matter on which a decision could be taken until the present Congress had decided what meaning was properly to be attached to the expression " nomenclature binaire " as used in Article 25 of the *Règles*. That matter having now been settled, he had accordingly (earlier during the present meeting) brought before the Commission the question of the availability of apparent new names in

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion* 29)

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 3 ; *6th Meeting Conclusion* 67) the index to the *Zoophylacium*, and the Commission, after examining the evidence, had decided that the above index was not available for nomenclatorial purposes and therefore that new names in it had no status under the *Régles* as from the date of being so published.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusion* 4)

Continuing the Acting President said that, although it was clearly necessary to correct the errors contained in *Opinion* 13, he now felt that the question of the decision to be taken in regard to the trivial name of the Sand Crab in place of that recorded in that *Opinion* should be governed, as in other cases of errors detected in earlier *Opinions*, by the principle of adopting whatever course would best promote stability and uniformity in the nomenclature of the group concerned. Where (as in the case of the name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858, erroneously placed on the " Official List " in *Opinion* 77), the name in question had passed into general use, the Commission had used their plenary powers to validate the erroneous decision made in the earlier *Opinion*, believing that it would be wrong to disturb existing practice for technical nomenclatorial reasons, particularly where (as in the case referred to) that practice owed its origin to an error made by the Commission itself. On the other hand in another case (regarding the type species of the genus *Mabuya* Fitzinger, 1826, about which a mistake had been made in *Opinion* 92), specialists in the group concerned had realised that the decision given by the Commission was erroneous and had accordingly ignored that decision. In this case the Commission had considered it sufficient to correct the previous error. In the present instance it was not so clear what was the best course to take. In the first place the Commission had not given in *Opinion* 13 an absolute ruling on the question of what was the oldest available trivial name for the Sand Crab ; all that they had done was to state that on the basis of the premises submitted (which they had not themselves verified) the oldest available trivial name for that species was *albicans* Bosc [1801–1802] (as published in the binominal combination *Ocypoda albicans*). This form of decision had been adopted in this and other early *Opinions* not because the Commission wished to impugn the accuracy of the premises submitted to them but because at that time (which was several years prior to the establishment of the first of the " Official Lists ") they did not regard it as part of their functions to give an absolute ruling in such a case. Nevertheless, this form of decision inevitably detracted from the authority of the ruling given and might therefore influence workers in deciding what name to apply to the species in question (in this case, the Sand Crab). So far however as he had been able to ascertain, this species, as the result, presumably, of *Opinion* 13, was now generally known by the trivial name *albicans* Bosc. If this was in fact the general practice, the consistent course for the Commission to adopt would be to use their plenary powers to validate the name *albicans* Bosc by suppressing the earlier available trivial name *quadratus* Fabricius 1787 (as published in the binominal combination *Cancer quadratus*). The species in question was, he understood, confined to the Atlantic shores of the American Continent from Rhode Island to Santa Catharina in Brazil. It was therefore desirable that the Commission should be in possession of the views of American specialists before they decided what action to take in this matter. In the circumstances, he (the Acting President) suggested that the Commission should now agree that their plenary powers should be used to validate the trivial name *albicans* Bosc as the trivial name of the Sand Crab, if after the close of the present Session specialists indicated that they considered that confusion would arise if, consequent upon the discovery of the error in the premises on which *Opinion* 13 had been based, it were necessary to replace the trivial name *albicans* Bosc by the trivial name *quadratus* Fabricius as the trivial name of the Sand Crab. This would not involve any delay in the publication of the *Opinion* recording the decisions taken on the present application, for some time would necessarily elapse before it would be possible to publish all the *Opinions* recording the decisions taken during the present Session, and the *Opinion* relating to the present matter could readily be left as one of the last to be so published. It would however be reasonable to fix some time limit, for the reception of comments. He suggested a period of six months from the date of the publication of the Minutes recording the present decision. At the same time he would take steps to bring the matter to the attention of specialists in the group concerned, particularly workers on the American Continent.

IN THE SUBSEQUENT DISCUSSION, it was generally agreed that it was essential that the errors in *Opinion* 13 should be corrected. It was felt however that this question was quite independent of the question of whether or not the plenary powers should be used to validate the name *albicans* Bosc [1801–1802], as the trivial name of the Sand Crab. On this, the general view was that, as it was the Commission itself which was mainly responsible for the acceptance of the foregoing name as the trivial name of this species, through their action in adopting *Opinion* 13 thirty-eight years earlier, they should certainly agree now that their plenary powers should be used if on enquiry it were to be found that specialists considered that confusion would ensue if it were necessary to adopt the name *quadratus* Fabricius as the trivial name of the Sand Crab.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to cancel *Opinion* 13, relating to the trivial name of the Sand Crab (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), the decision set forth in that *Opinion* being incomplete, in part incorrect, and the whole entirely misleading ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion* 51)

(2) that, even if (contrary to the decision noted in the margin) the names published in 1771 by Edwards (G.) in his edition of Mark Catesby's *Natural History of Carolina*, had been available under the *Règles*, the trivial name *arenarius* as so published by Edwards in 1771 in the binominal combination *Cancer arenarius*, though the first such name given to the Sand Crab subsequent to the starting point of zoological nomenclature (1758), would have been invalid, since that name would in any case have been a homonym of the earlier trivial name *arenarius* Toreen, 1765 (as published in the binominal combination *Cancer arenarius*), a name bestowed by Toreen upon an entirely different species found at a place named Queda in the Straits of Malacca, an area far removed from that in which the Sand Crab occurred ; and that the trivial name *arenarius* as published by Edwards in 1771 should now be placed on the " Official Index " ;

(3) that the first trivial name bestowed upon the Sand Crab after the name *arenarius* had been cited in connection therewith by Edwards in 1771 was the trivial name *quadratus* Fabricius, 1787 (as published in Vol. 1 of the *Mantissa Insectorum* in the binominal combination *Cancer quadratus*) ;

(*Previous references: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusions* 29 *and* 52)

(4) that the trivial name *quadratus* Fabricius, 1787, was an available name, not being invalidated by the prior use of the same trivial name in combination (or association) with the generic name *Cancer* (a) by Meuschen in 1781 in his index to the *Zoophylacium Gronovianum* of Gronovius, and (b) by Meuschen in 1778 in his own work, the *Museum Gronovianum*, both of which the Commission had ruled to have failed to comply with the requirements of the *Règles*, names published in these works, in consequence, possessing no status in zoological nomenclature ;

(5) before deciding what action should be taken in regard to the trivial name of the Sand Crab, consequent upon the discovery of the error in regard thereto contained in the Commission's *Opinion* 13, to ascertain from interested specialists whether, in their opinion, confusion and instability would ensue, if it were now necessary to rectify the erroneous decision published as far back as 1910 in the *Opinion* referred to above, and if, in consequence, it were now necessary to use the trivial name *quadratus* Fabricius for the foregoing species ; and for this purpose to request the Secretary to the Commission to seek the views on this question held by interested specialists by the publication of a notice in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* or otherwise ;

(6) that, on the expiry of a period of six months from the date of the publication of the present decision in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, the following action should be taken in the light of the comments received from specialists in response to the consultation referred to in (5) above :—

  (a) *if specialists were of the opinion that confusion and instability would result from the adoption of the trivial name* quadratus *Fabricius for the Sand Crab:* to use the Commission's plenary powers (i) to suppress the trivial name *quadratus* Fabricius, 1787 (as published in the binominal combination *Cancer quadratus*) and to validate the trivial name *albicans* Bosc [1801–1802] (as published in the binominal combination *Ocypoda albicans*), at the same time placing the first of these trivial names on the " Official Index of Invalid and Rejected Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " and the second on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

  (b) *if specialists were of the opinion that confusion and instability would not result from the adoption of the trivial name* quadratus *Fabricius for the Sand Crab:* to place the trivial name *quadratus* Fabricius, 1787 (as published in the binominal combination *Cancer quadratus*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(7) on a decision being taken either in the sense indicated in (6)(a) above or in that indicated in (6)(b) above, to render an *Opinion* recording the

decisions specified in (1) to (4) above, and setting out, as the case may be, either the decision specified in (6)(a) above or that specified in (6)(b) above.

" Opinions " 16, certain generic names discussed in, placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology "

54. THE COMMISSION examined Notes 3 to 5 of the " Editorial Notes " attached to the reissue in 1947 of *Opinion* 16 (interpreting the application of Rule (d) in Article 30 of the *Règles* in cases where at the time of the original publication of the generic name in question there had been cited as a synonym of one of the included species a pre-1758 univerbal specific name consisting of the same word as that selected as the name for the genus in which the species in question was included). In these notes, the Secretary to the Commission had referred to the 63 genera, the type species of which had been discussed in *Opinion* 16, pointing out that it was very unsatisfactory for the status of individual names to be discussed in detail in *Opinions* rendered by the Commission in which, however, no decision was given by the Commission on the questions so discussed. Decisions had been taken in *Opinion* 16 on two only of the 63 names involved, but in later *Opinions* the type species of 32 of the other genera had been determined, the generic names in question having then been placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology." In addition, two of the generic names concerned (*Holothuria* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Simia* Linnaeus, 1758) had since been suppressed for nomenclatorial purposes under the Commission's plenary powers. Thus, of the generic names discussed in *Opinion* 16, there were still 27 names on which no decision had ever been taken by the Commission. The Secretary to the Commission had suggested that the Commission should dispose of this matter by at once taking these names into consideration, with a view to placing on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " all of the names in question in respect of which it was found, on enquiry, that the species accepted by specialists as the type species of the genera concerned were the species which, under the provisions of *Opinion* 16, were, under the *Règles*, their type species by absolute tautonymy.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusion* 2)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that, since the time when, as Secretary to the Commission, he had submitted the foregoing recommendations, the Commission itself (at the meeting noted in the margin) had placed on record its disapproval of the practice by which formerly the Commission had (as in the present case) discussed the status of individual names in their *Opinions* without coming to any decision in regard thereto, and had decided that the older *Opinions* should be examined from this point of view for the purpose of remedying defects of this kind as rapidly as possible. Most of the names involved in the present case were the names of very common and widely known genera and it was desirable that the position as regards these should be clarified with the least possible further delay. He accordingly recommended that the Commission should now decide to place on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " all those of the 27 generic names in question, in respect of which inquiry showed that the names in question were accepted by specialists as taxonomically valid genera and the species accepted as the type species of the genera concerned were those which, as indicated in the second paragraph of *Opinion* 16, would be the type species, if, under the interpretation of Rule (d) in Article 30 given in that *Opinion*, the type species of those genera fell to be determined by absolute tautonymy. If in any case it were to be found that the name in question was either unavailable nomenclatorially or that current practice was not in harmony with the *Règles*, as interpreted in *Opinion* 16, the Commission should, he suggested, consider whether confusion would be likely to ensue if the *Règles* were to be strictly applied in that case. If the Commission were now to deal in the manner suggested with the cases raised, but left unsettled, in *Opinion* 16, it would be helpful, if at the same time they were to place on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " the names of the two genera, the type species of which had been settled in that *Opinion*.

IN DISCUSSION general agreement was expressed with the proposals submitted by the Acting President.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to place on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " the names of the undermentioned genera, the type species of which had been determined by the Commission in *Opinion* 16 :—

Alca Linnaeus, 1758 (type species, by absolute tautonymy : *Alca torda* Linnaeus, 1758) (Class Aves)

Equus Linnaeus, 1758 (type species, by absolute tautonymy : *Equus caballus* Linnaeus, 1758) (Class Mammalia) ;

(2) to invite the Secretary to the Commission to make inquiries, by the publication of a notice in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* or otherwise, in regard to each of the undermentioned generic

names discussed in *Opinion* 16, for the purpose of ascertaining the views currently held by specialists on the question whether, as regards each of the genera so named, the generic name was available nomenclatorially, the genus was a taxonomically valid genus and the species accepted as its type species was the species which, as shown in the second paragraph of *Opinion* 16 (1947, *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature,* **1** : 259–261), would be the type species if Rule (d) in Article 30, as interpreted by *Opinion* 16, were in fact applicable to the name of the genus concerned :—

(a) *Names of genera of the Class Mammalia (Commission File Z.N.(S.)*275) :—
  Camelus Linnaeus, 1758
  Rhinoceros Linnaeus, 1758

(b) *Names of genera of the Class Aves* (*Commission File Z.N.(S.)*274) :—
  Caprimulgus Linnaeus, 1758
  Certhia Linnaeus, 1758
  Charadrius Linnaeus, 1758
  Corvus Linnaeus, 1758
  Cuculus Linnaeus, 1758
  Fringilla Linnaeus, 1758
  Fulica Linnaeus, 1758
  Loxia Linnaeus, 1758
  Meleagris Linnaeus, 1758
  Merops Linnaeus, 1758
  Motacilla Linnaeus, 1758
  Otis Linnaeus, 1758
  Pavo Linnaeus, 1758
  Pelecanus Linnaeus, 1758
  Phasianus Linnaeus, 1758
  Scopolax Linnaeus, 1758
  Sterna Linnaeus, 1758
  Strix Linnaeus, 1758
  Tetrao Linnaeus, 1758
  Tringa Linnaeus, 1758
  Upupa Linnaeus, 1758
  Vultur Linnaeus, 1758

(c) *Names of genera of the Class Pisces* (*Commission File Z.N.(S.)*276) :—
  Gymnotus Linnaeus, 1758
  Stromateus Linnaeus, 1758

(d) *The name of a genus in the Phylum Protozoa (Commission File Z.N.(S.)277)* :—
Chaos Linnaeus, 1767

(3) on the completion of the inquiry referred to in (2) above or of any part thereof :—

(a) to place forthwith on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " each of the generic names specified in (2) above which the inquiry so completed had shown was currently regarded by specialists as the name of a taxonomically valid genus and of which the species accepted as the type species was the species specified in the second paragraph of *Opinion* 16, and on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " the trivial names of the type species of the genera concerned ;

(b) that a statement regarding the position as regards each of the generic names specified in (2) above, which the inquiry had disclosed was either not regarded by specialists as the name of a taxonomically valid genus or for which the species commonly accepted as the type species was not the species so specified in the second paragraph of *Opinion* 16 should be submitted to the Commission by the Secretary, together with proposals for determining, at the earliest possible date, the status of the generic name in question (including the determination of its type species) and for placing on the appropriate " Official Lists " or " Official Indexes " the generic names concerned and the trivial names of the respective type species of those genera ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decision specified in (1) ;

(5) on the close of the inquiries specified in (2) above, to render an *Opinion* or *Opinions* giving effect to the decision specified in (3) (a) above, in relation to any generic name or generic names specified in (a), (b), (c), or (d) in (2) above, to which, as the result of those inquiries, that decision thereupon applied.

"Taenia" Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Cestoidea); use of the plenary powers (1) to designate "Taenia solium" Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of, and (2) to validate an erroneous entry relating to, in the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" (correction of an error in "Opinion" 84)

55. THE COMMISSION examined Note 7 of the "Editorial Notes" attached to the reissue in 1947 of *Opinion* 16, submitted by the Secretary to the Commission on the subject of an inconsistency in the treatment accorded to the generic name *Taenia* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Cestoidea) in *Opinions* 16 and 84, and the consequent error in the second of those *Opinions* in regard to the type species of that genus (Hemming, 1947, in *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* **1** : 297–302). The Secretary to the Commission had pointed out that in *Opinion* 16 the Commission had correctly noted that in the original description of the genus *Taenia*, Linnaeus had cited the pre-1758 univerbal specific name "Taenia" as a synonym of one of the species (*Taenia vulgaris*) which he then included in that genus. Accordingly, under the interpretation of Rule (d) in Article 30 given in the foregoing *Opinion*, the species *Taenia vulgaris* Linnaeus, 1758, was the type species of the genus *Taenia* Linnaeus, 1758, by absolute tautonymy, unless it could be shown that the word "Taenia" as used by the pre-1758 author cited by Linnaeus had not been used as a univerbal specific name in the sense of "The Taenia". Some fifteen years after the publication of *Opinion* 16, the Commission had before them an application for a number of names to be placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology", one of which was the name *Taenia* Linnaeus, 1758. The applicant had asked that this name should be added to the "Official List" on the basis that its type species under the *Règles* was *Taenia solium* Linnaeus, 1758. In apparent total forgetfulness of what they had said about this generic name in *Opinion* 16, the Commission had thereupon in *Opinion* 84 placed the generic name *Taenia* Linnaeus on the "Official List" with *Taenia solium* Linnaeus as its type species, but without any indication as to how this species came to occupy that position. Everyone was agreed in treating *Taenia solium* Linnaeus as the type species of the genus *Taenia* Linnaeus; everyone was agreed also that great and totally unjustifiable confusion would arise, if, for any technical nomenclatorial reason, that species were to be displaced from its position as the type species of this important genus. Nevertheless, there was no doubt that under the *Règles* that species could no longer be accepted as the type species of the genus *Taenia* Linnaeus, unless either (a) it could be shown that the circumstances in which the word "Taenia" had been cited by Linnaeus as a synonym of *Taenia vulgaris* Linnaeus did not satisfy the requirements laid down in *Opinion* 16 and therefore that that species was not the type species of the genus *Taenia* Linnaeus by absolute tautonymy, or (b) specialists subjectively identified the nominal species *Taenia vulgaris* Linnaeus with *Taenia solium* Linnaeus. Noone had attempted to advance the first of these arguments, and there appeared no grounds on which a claim, so based, could be sustained. It must be accepted, therefore, that under the *Règles* the type species of the genus *Taenia* Linnaeus was *Taenia vulgaris* Linnaeus. Nor could any help be looked for from the second of the two possible lines of argument suggested above, for, far from identifying the nominal species *Taenia vulgaris* Linnaeus with the nominal species *Taenia solium* Linnaeus, specialists were agreed in identifying *Taenia vulgaris* with *Taenia lata* Linnaeus, 1758, the third of the four species placed by Linnaeus in the genus *Taenia*. Further, the trivial name *vulgaris* Linnaeus was usually sunk as a synonym of the trivial name *lata* Linnaeus, although the former had page precedence. Finally, it should be noted that the species *lata* Linnaeus (=*vulgaris* Linnaeus) was not regarded by specialists as even being congeneric with *Taenia solium* Linnaeus, the former species being referred either to the genus *Dibothriocephalus* Luhe, 1899, or to the genus *Diphyllobothrium* Cobbold, 1858. Thus, the strict application of the *Règles* in this case would create the maximum of confusion by not only removing the species bearing the trivial name *solium* Linnaeus from the genus *Taenia* Linnaeus, of which it was universally accepted as the type species (following its selection as such by Braun in 1900), but also by the transfer of the universally known generic name *Taenia* Linnaeus to a genus for which that name was never used. The only way by which these disastrous results could be avoided would be by the Commission using their plenary powers to designate *Taenia solium* Linnaeus as the type species of the genus *Taenia* Linnaeus. This therefore was the course which the Secretary to the Commission had recommended the Commission to adopt.

IN DISCUSSION it was agreed that it was unthinkable that the Commission should countenance the devastating confusion which would result from a strict application of the *Règles* in the present case. The plenary powers should certainly be used in the manner proposed.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to set aside the indication of *Taenia vulgaris* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Taenia* Linnaeus, 1758, by absolute tautonymy, and also all selections of that or other species to be the type species of this genus, made prior to the present decision ;

(b) to designate *Taenia solium* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the genus *Taenia* Linnaeus, 1758 ;

(2) to insert in the entry in the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " relating to the generic name *Taenia* Linnaeus, 1758, a note stating that the species *Taenia solium* Linnaeus, 1758, was the type species of the foregoing genus by designation by the Commission under their plenary powers ;

(3) to place the trivial name *solium* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Taenia solium*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion*, supplementary to *Opinion* 84, drawing attention to the error contained therein as respects the generic name *Taenia* Linnaeus, 1758, and recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

Schneider (J. G.), 1784, " Samml. Abhandl. Aufklar. Zoologie Handlungsgeschichte " : (1) suppression under the plenary powers of the generic name " Octopodia " Schneider and of five trivial names published in that genus ; (2) eight reputed generic names declared to be cheironyms ; (3) " Octopus " Cuvier, [1797], and " Eledone " Leach, 1817, placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology "

56. THE COMMISSION examined the Appendix annexed to *Opinion* 166, in which the Secretary to the Commission had pointed out that the alleged generic name *Pompilus* Schneider, 1784 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Nautiloidea), which was referred to in the discussion on the generic name *Pompilus* Fabricius, 1798 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) dealt with in *Opinion* 166, was a cheironym, that seven other reputed generic names alleged to have been published by Schneider in the same paper were also cheironyms but that the paper by that author in which those names were alleged to have been published did contain a new generic name (*Octopodia*), which, though completely overlooked by later authors, was an available name and had priority over the extremely well-known name *Octopus* Cuvier, [1797] (Hemming, 1945, in *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* **2** : 388–394). In the foregoing paper, the Secretary to the Commission recalled that at their Session held at Lisbon in 1935, at which (in the absence of the Secretary through ill-health) he had officiated as Acting Secretary, the Commission had agreed that after the close of that Session he (Commissioner Hemming) should examine the bibliographical references cited in the documents considered at Lisbon with a view to correcting any errors that might be found therein, before the Report then submitted by the Commission to the Congress was published. It was in the discharge of the duty so entrusted to him that

(Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion 2)

he had examined the work by Schneider published in 1784 under the title *Sammlung vermischter Abhandlungen zur Aufklärung der Zoologie und der Handlungsgeschichte.* On doing so, he had found at once that, what Schneider had done was to erect a new genus *Octopodia* Schneider and to place in it the five species which Linnaeus had placed in the genus *Sepia*, one of Linnaeus' species of *Argonauta*, one of his species of *Nautilus* and one species (*Octopodia moschites*) not described in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae.* For five of these eight species Schneider published new trivial names. The generic name *Octopodia* occurred only once, on page 108 at the head of the genus, and the trivial names of the eight species placed by Schneider in this genus were each printed with a capital initial letter. It was these facts which had no doubt been responsible for the mistake which later authors had fallen into of supposing that these eight names were generic names. It was desirable that these eight reputed but non-existent generic names should now be formally branded as cheironyms by the Commission. Further, consideration should be given to the question of using the plenary powers for the purpose of suppressing the totally neglected generic name *Octopodia* Schneider, 1784, for otherwise the name *Octopus* Cuvier, [1797], would disappear into synonymy.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that subsequent to the publication of the paper reproduced as an Appendix to *Opinion* 166, Mr. R. Winckworth (London) had submitted a more detailed application in which, after concurring in the general conclusions reached by himself (the Acting President), he had proposed that, in addition to making it clear that the eight generic names attributed to Schneider were non-existent, being based upon a misreading of Schneider's book, the Commission should (a) suppress the one generic name which Schneider had in fact published in the portion of his *Sammlung* under consideration (namely *Octopodia* Schneider, 1784) and also the five new trivial names which he had published, which had been totally neglected through having been misread as being generic names, the introduction of which could only cause confusion, and (b) place on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " the well known generic names *Octopus* Cuvier, [1797], and *Eledone* Leach, 1817. Both had been challenged by some workers on the ground in the one case that it was a synonym of *Polypus* Schneider, 1784, and, in the other case, that it was a synonym of *Moschites* Schneider, 1784, two of the reputed but non-existant generic names referred to above.

The suppression of *Octopodia* Schneider, 1784, and the elimination of these ghost names would make *Octopus* Cuvier an available name and *Polypus* Leach, 1817 (which through the disappearance of the reputed name *Polypus* Schneider, 1784, was seen not to be invalid as a homonym), would become an objective synonym of *Octopus* Cuvier [1797]. *Eledone* Leach 1817 was also an available name, the older name *Ozoena* Rafinesque, 1814, being invalid as a homonym.

In discussion, there was general agreement that advantage should be taken of the Report submitted by the Secretary to prevent a recurrence of the type of confusion in regard to the trivial names published by Schneider which had embarrassed the discussion at Lisbon of the case of the name *Pompilus* Fabricius, 1798. For this purpose those names should be suppressed, as also should be the totally forgotten generic name *Octopodia* Schneider, 1784.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to suppress :—

(a) the generic name *Octopodia* Schneider, 1784 (Class Cephalopoda) ;

(b) the undermentioned specific trivial names:—

moschites Schneider, 1784 (as published in the binominal combination *Octopodia moschites*)

nautilus Schneider, 1784 (as published in the binominal combination *Octopodia nautilus*)

polypus Schneider, 1784 (as published in the binominal combination *Octopodia polypus*)

sepia Schneider, 1784 (as published in the binominal combination *Octopodia sepia*)

teuthis Schneider, 1784 (as published in the binominal combination *Octopodia teuthis*) ;

(2) to declare that the undermentioned reputed generic names were never published by Schneider, the names so attributed to that author being cheironyms, owing their alleged existence to a misreading by later authors of the relevant passage in Schneider's *Sammlung vermischter Abhandlungen zur Aufklärung der Zoologie und der Handlungsgeschichte* where he used as trivial names of species of his own genus *Octopodia* the words later wrongly thought to have been published by him as generic names, the error arising (it must be supposed)

from the fact that, following the practice of many 18th century authors, he printed the words in question with capital initial letters and did not actually combine the trivial names in question with the name of the genus (*Octopodia*) to which he referred those species, that generic name being cited only at the head of the account given for the genus :—

Loligo Schneider, 1784
Moschites Schneider, 1784
Nautilus Schneider, 1784
Polypus Schneider, 1784
Pompilus Schneider, 1784 (as already recorded in *Opinion* 166)
Sepia Schneider, 1784
Sepiola Schneider, 1784
Teuthis Schneider, 1784 ;

(3) to place the undermentioned generic names on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " :—

Eledone Leach, 1817 (type species, by monotypy : *Octopus moschatus* Lamarck, 1798) (Class Cephalopoda, Order Decapoda)

Octopus Cuvier [1797] (type species, by absolute tautonymy under the principle laid down in *Opinion* 16 : *Octopus vulgaris* (correction of *vulgare*) Cuvier [1797]) (Class Cephalopoda, Order Decapoda) ;

(4) to place the undermentioned generic names and alleged generic names on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " :—

Loligo Schneider, 1784 (a cheironym possessing no status under the *Règles*)

Moschites Schneider, 1784 (a cheironym possessing no status under the *Règles*)

Nautilus Schneider, 1784 (a cheironym possessing no status under the *Règles*)

Octopodia Schneider, 1784 (suppressed under the plenary powers under (1)(a) above)

Ozoena Rafinesque, 1814 (invalid, because a junior homonym of *Ozaena* Olivier, 1812)

Polypus Leach, 1817 (invalid, because an objective synonym of *Octopus* Cuvier [1797])

Polypus Schneider, 1784 (a cheironym possessing no status under the *Règles*)

Pompilus Schneider, 1784 (a cheironym possessing no status under the *Règles*)

Sepia Schneider, 1784 (a cheironym possessing no status under the *Règles*)

Sepiola Schneider, 1784 (a cheironym possessing no status under the *Règles*)

Teuthis Schneider, 1784 (a cheironym possessing no status under the *Règles*)

(5) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " :—

moschatus Lamarck, 1798 (as published in the binominal combination *Octopus moschatus*)

vulgaris Cuvier [1797] (as published in the binominal combination *Octopus vulgaris*) ;

(6) to place on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " the undermentioned trivial names suppressed under the plenary powers under (1)(b) above :—

moschites Schneider, 1784 (as published in the binominal combination *Octopodia moschites*)

nautilus Schneider, 1784 (as published in the binominal combination *Octopodia nautilus*)

polypus Schneider, 1784 (as published in the binominal combination *Octopodia polypus*)

sepia Schneider, 1784 (as published in the binominal combination *Octopodia sepia*)

teuthis Schneider, 1784 (as published in the binominal combination *Octopodia teuthis*) ;

(7) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (6) above.

" Opinions " already published (individual questions of zoological nomenclature arising in) : Report to Section on Nomenclature on conclusions reached by the Commission in regard to

57. Having now completed their examination of the proposals relating to individual questions of nomenclature submitted either (a) in the " Editorial Notes " attached to reissues of certain of the older *Opinions* originally published in 1910 or in footnotes to those reissues, or (b) (in one case) in an Appendix to an *Opinion* rendered in pursuance of a decision taken at their Session held at Lisbon in 1935, THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to report to the Section on Nomenclature the conclusions reached in regard to the undermentioned matters arising out of an examination of *Opinions* already rendered by the Commission :—

(a) the status of names in Nozeman and Vosmaer, 1758, *Geslachten der Vogelen* (Conclusion 50);

(b) the status of names in the edition of the pre-1758 work by Mark Catesby entitled *Natural History of Carolina* edited by George Edwards and published in 1771 (Conclusion 51);

(c) the status of names in Meuschen (F. C.), 1778, *Museum Gronovianum* (Conclusion 52);

(d) the trivial name of the Sand Crab (Conclusion 53);

(e) the type species of certain genera discussed in *Opinion* 16 (Conclusion 54);

(f) the type species of the genus *Taenia* Linnaeus, 1758 (Conclusion 55);

(g) the status to be accorded, under the plenary powers or otherwise, to certain names and alleged names published by Schneider in 1784 (Conclusion 56);

(2) to invite the Acting President, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, to report forthwith to the Section on Nomenclature the conclusions reached by the Commission in regard to the cases specified in (1) above.

(*The Acting President thereupon submitted a report on the above cases to the Section on Nomenclature.*)

" Opinions " 1-133 : arrangements to be made for publication of " facsimile " edition of

58. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) invited the Commission at this stage to consider the question of the re-publication of the older *Opinions*, many of which were now out of print and practically unobtainable. The position generally as regards the *Opinions* of the Commission had changed materially as the result of decisions taken by the Commission, in agreement with the Section on Nomenclature, in the course of the present Session. Formerly, these had been the sole official record of decisions taken by the Commission on questions submitted to them. This would still be the case during inter-Congress periods as regards *Opinions* published since the last preceding Congress, but would cease to be so after the Congress next following the adoption of any given *Opinion*, for under the arrangements which had now been agreed upon, all decisions recorded in such *Opinions* would at that Congress be inserted in the appropriate schedule to the *Règles*. Nevertheless the *Opinions* rendered by the Commission would always be of great value, quite apart from their historical interest, for many of them contained important information on a wide range of subjects, which was not to be found anywhere else. No zoological library with any pretension to completeness could possibly afford to be without a complete set. There were adequate supplies available of the *Opinions* rendered subsequent to the date when (in 1939) the Commission itself assumed responsibility for publication but this was not the case as respects many of the *Opinions* published before that date. It was for this reason that the first *Opinions* to be published directly by the Commission (i.e. *Opinion* 134 and later *Opinions*) had been issued as Parts of Volume 2 of the work *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*, Volume I at the same time being reserved for the re-publication of the older *Opinions*, which had originally been published on behalf of the Commission by the Smithsonian Institution. As the Commission knew, various circumstances had led to only a small start having been made with the publication of parts of Volume I, but it was proposed that, as and when circumstances permitted, further instalments should be published. A new situation had however been created by the action taken during the present Congress, for the majority of the *Opinions* in question had now been repealed for all except historical purposes, consequent upon the decisions recorded therein being incorporated, in whole or in part, either in the *Règles* themselves or in the Schedules thereto. In addition, a few of these *Opinions* had been cancelled as being incorrect, while the decisions in two *Opinions* were to be reconsidered by the Commission, the subjects dealt with therein being in the mean time regarded as *sub judice*. In these circumstances, it would clearly be neither necessary nor desirable to attach to future reissues of these *Opinions* " Editorial Notes " of the kind which had been attached to the reissues so far published. It would however be essential to publish a prefatory statement setting out the decisions in regard to these *Opinions* which had been taken by the present Congress, for otherwise the re-publication of these *Opinions* would be very misleading. As regards the form in which these *Opinions* should be re-published, the best course would, he (the Acting President) thought, be to publish a *facsimile* edition, thereby ensuring absolute identity between the original, and the new editions.

DR. E. A. CHAPIN (U.S.A.) (a member of the Section on Nomenclature in attendance) said that he had never himself experienced any difficulty in consulting a copy of the original edition of the older *Opinions* ; he wondered therefore whether it was essential that these should be re-published.

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) said that, whatever might be the position in America, very few institutions in Europe possessed sets of the older *Opinions* and it was virtually impossible at the present time to purchase copies on the second-hand market. He was therefore strongly in favour of the re-publication of the older *Opinions* in the manner proposed. He agreed that in existing circumstances, a *facsimile* edition would be the most satisfactory.

DR. E. A. CHAPIN (U.S.A.) explained that he had not been aware of the situation in European institutions, when he had made the suggestion that the re-publication of the older *Opinions* might not be necessary. In the circumstances, he naturally now unreservedly withdrew that suggestion.

IN FURTHER DISCUSSION, the view was generally expressed that it was desirable that the reissue of the older *Opinions* should be completed by the Commission as rapidly as might be found to be practicable. Many misunderstandings of decisions by the Commission had occurred in the past through workers being forced, through the impossibility of consulting these *Opinions*, to rely upon the " summaries " published elsewhere.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) agreed that it was desirable :—

(a) that, having regard to the fact that in Europe and other parts of the world there were many important zoological institutions which were not in possession of sets of *Opinions* 1–133, and that many of these *Opinions* were now out of print and virtually unobtainable, arrangements should be made for the re-publication, as soon as might be practicable, of these *Opinions* in Volume 1 of the work *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature;*

(b) that, in order to ensure complete identity between the edition of the foregoing *Opinions* now to be published and the edition in which they had been originally published, the new edition should be a *facsimile* edition of the original edition, with the addition thereto of a comprehensive subject index ;

(2) agreed that, in view of the altered status of the *Opinions* so far rendered by the Commission, consequent upon the decision taken during the present Session to incorporate the rulings given therein, either in the *Règles* themselves or in the schedules thereto, there would be no need for the publication of "Editorial Notes" containing commentaries on the *Opinions* now to be republished such as had been attached to such of the reissues of *Opinions* as had so far been published (*Opinions* 1–16) but that there should be published a prefatory statement setting out the decisions in regard to the *Opinions* in question taken by the present Congress ;

(3) invited the Secretary to the Commission to draw the attention of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature to the conclusion recorded in (1) above, with a request that, subject to their meeting other urgent calls on their financial resources, they should arrange for the completion as soon as practicable of Volume 1 of the work *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* in the manner specified in (1) and (2) above.

Human malaria parasites, generic and trivial names of: (1) use of the plenary powers to validate existing nomenclatorial practice ; (2) cancellation of erroneous decisions regarding, in "Opinion" 104 ; (3) insertion of amended particulars in the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" and matters incidental thereto

59. In accordance with the arrangement recorded in Conclusion 45 above, THE COMMISSION now turned to examine Commission File Z.N.(S.)143, relating to certain errors in regard to the nomenclature of the human malaria parasites contained in the portion of *Opinion* 104, in which the generic names *Plasmodium* and *Laverania* were placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology." This file contained :—

(a) the extensive correspondence between the Secretary to the Commission and leading malariologists in Great Britain and the United States, which had taken place both prior to, and subsequent to, the discovery by the Secretary to the Commission of the need for extensive corrections in the entries in the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" relating to the names *Plasmodium* and *Laverania*, those entries, though in accord with current nomenclatorial practice, being incorrect in almost every possible respect ;

(b) an application submitted to the Commission in 1944 jointly by Dr. Robert L. Usinger and Dr. C. W.

Sabrosky (then of the U.S. Public Health Service, Malaria Control in War Areas, Atlanta, Georgia, U.S.A.) drawing attention to the serious errors contained in the entries in the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " made under the authority of *Opinion* 104, and requesting the Commission to use their plenary powers to validate existing nomenclatorial practice, in view of the grave confusion which would result from the strict application of the *Règles* in these cases ;

(c) a paper prepared by the Secretary to the Commission :—

   (i) examining in detail the early literature relating to the generic and trivial names published, or alleged to have been published, for the human malaria parasites ;

   (ii) setting out, in the light of (i) above, the names correctly applicable to the species in question under a strict application of the *Règles* thereto ;

   (iii) drawing attention to the extensive changes in current nomenclatorial practice which such an application of the *Règles* would involve and the appalling confusion to which it would inevitably give rise ;

   (iv) recommending the Commission to use their plenary powers to give valid force to existing nomenclatorial practice, for this purpose suppressing certain generic and trivial names, validating other such names, and, in one case (*Plasmodium* Marchiafava and Celli, 1885) designating as the type species of a genus a species not included therein by the original authors of the generic name concerned.

On being invited by the Acting President to open the discussion on the proposal which, jointly with Dr. C. W. Sabrosky, he had submitted to the Commission on this subject, ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER ROBERT L. USINGER (U.S.A.) said that, when he had taken part in preparing that application, he had examined the nomenclatorial problems involved and had satisfied himself that the action under the plenary powers there recommended was necessary, if the gravest confusion in malariological literature was to be avoided. The detailed considerations involved were, however, no longer fresh in his memory. He would therefore greatly prefer that this problem should be placed before the Commission by the Acting President, who, he knew, was thoroughly familiar with every aspect of this case.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said :

(1) In the paper which, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, he had prepared on this subject and which would be published in the *Opinion* recording the decisions taken by the Commission at the close of the present discussion, he had given full particulars regarding the bibliographical and similar problems with which this case abounded. The Commission, he felt sure, would not wish him on the present occasion to go into these minor questions in detail, but would wish rather that he should concentrate upon drawing their attention to those major matters, a due appreciation of which was essential to a proper understanding of the questions on which decisions were now required.

(2) It was important at the outset to realise what were the assumptions on which current practice in regard to the generic and specific nomenclature of the human malaria parasites was based. These assumptions, which, prior to the publication in 1938 of the important paper by Christophers and Sinton, had been universally accepted as valid, by all malariologists, were as follows :—

(a) The generic name *Oscillaria* applied by Laveran in 1881 to the first of the human malaria parasites to be discovered had been universally rejected as inapplicable or invalid.

(b) It had been assumed that the species to which in 1881 Laveran gave the trivial name *malariae* (i.e. *Oscillaria malariae* Laveran, 1881) was the Quartan Malaria Parasite, to which therefore the trivial name *malariae* Laveran had been universally applied.

(c) The generic name *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885, had been accepted as the oldest available generic name for any species of human malaria parasite. It had been accepted as a monotypical genus, having as its type species the Quartan Malaria Parasite. That species had accordingly been referred by all workers to the genus *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli.

(d) Those malariologists who had regarded the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite as generically distinct from the Quartan Malaria Parasite had referred the first of these species to the genus *Laverania* Feletti & Grassi, 1890.

(e) The trivial name *malariae* applied (in the binominal combination *Laverania malariae*) by Feletti and Grassi in 1890 to the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite had been rejected for that species on the ground that, having regard to the subsequent union on taxonomic grounds of the Malignant Tertian and Quartan Malaria Parasites in a single genus (*Plasmodium*), this name was an invalid homonym of the earlier trivial name *malariae* Laveran, 1881 (as published in the binominal combination *Oscillaria malariae*), which (as shown in (b) above) had been universally identified with the Quartan Malaria Parasite.

(f) The trivial name *vivax* Grassi & Feletti, 1890 (as published in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba vivax*) had been accepted as the oldest available, and therefore as the valid, name of the Benign Tertian Malaria Parasite.

(g) The trivial name *praecox* Grassi & Feletti, 1890 (as published in the binominal combination (*Haemamoeba praecox*) had been rejected as a name for the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite on the ground that, although Grassi and Feletti referred in their description of that species to cases of human malaria which specialists were agreed could only have been due to that parasite, the description itself was based upon an avian parasite.

(h) The trivial name *immaculata* Grassi, 1890 (as published in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba immaculata*) had been rejected as a name for the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite on grounds similar to those explained in (g) above in the case of the trivial name *praecox* Grassi & Feletti.

(i) It had been supposed that the next trivial name to have been published for the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite was the name *falciparum* Welch, 1897 (as published in the binominal combination *Haematozoon falciparum*). This name had accordingly been adopted as the trivial name of this parasite.

(3) The commonly accepted assumptions in regard to the nomenclature of the Quartan and Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasites (as set out in (2) above) were incorrect in every particular, both as regards the trivial names of those species and as regards the names of the genera to which, under the *Règles*, they should be referred. In view of the complex problems involved, he (the Acting President)

proposed to deal separately with the generic and trivial names, taking the trivial names first. As regards the latter, the considerations which were relevant were the following :—

(a) Christophers and Sinton (1938) had shown, as the result of a detailed examination of Laveran's early papers (including, in particular, the paper published in 1881 in which that worker had published the name *Oscillaria malariae*) that the material at Laveran's disposal consisted not of the Quartan Malaria Parasite (as hitherto universally assumed for nearly 40 years) but of the flagellating sexual forms of the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite. Accordingly, the trivial name *malariae* Laveran, 1881, was the oldest available name for, and therefore the valid name of, the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite and was not applicable to the Quartan Malaria Parasite.

(b) The assumption that, when in 1885 they established the genus *Plasmodium*, Marchiafava and Celli placed in that genus the species named *Oscillaria malariae* by Laveran four years earlier was incorrect. They made no reference to Laveran's species and accordingly must be regarded as having published a new specific name (i.e. binominal combination), *Plasmodium malariae*, for the species which they then described. The material to which those authors applied that name consisted overwhelmingly of the asexual amoeboid form of the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite, though included among that material there were also examples which had recently been identified by Dr. Martin Young (1946) as the Benign Tertian Malaria Parasite. As the latter was the one species of human malaria parasite to which no author had as yet applied the trivial name *malariae*, he (the Acting President) had himself in the paper now before the Commission selected (under Article 31) the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite (of the asexual amoeboid form) to be the species to which the trivial name *malariae* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885 (originally published, as shown above, as the trivial name of a composite nominal species) should adhere.

(c) The Quartan Malaria Parasite was first distinguished from the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite by Golgi in 1885. Neither then however nor in his better known paper of 1889 did Golgi give a trivial name to the new species, the existence of which he had so established. It was not until the end of 1889 that a name was given to this species by Grassi & Feletti. In this paper (which was usually wrongly attributed to the year 1890, in which it was reprinted in the *Riforma medica*) these authors gave the trivial name *malariae* to this species, which they placed in a new genus, which they called *Haemamoeba*, at the same time placing the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite (which they correctly called *malariae*) in a new genus, *Laverania*, named after the worker by whom that species had first been discovered.

(d) In 1890 Grassi & Feletti had published the trivial name *praecox* (in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba praecox*) for an avian parasite which they stated had been found also in the blood of human malaria patients. Specialists were agreed that the latter parasite could only have been the amoeboid form of the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite. The trivial name *praecox* Grassi & Feletti could not however be applied to that species, since the description of the species so named given by those authors was taken from the avian parasite, which was now recognised as being a distinct species.

(e) In 1890 also, Antolisei and Angelini (in a paper which had been completely overlooked) had published a description of the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite under the trivial name *falciforme* (in the binominal combination *Ematozoo falciforme*, the generic name of which was published with a small initial letter).

(f) Grassi in 1891 had published the trivial name *immaculata* (in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba immaculata*) for a parasite found in the blood of a young Kestrel. Unfortunately, Grassi added the observation that this was the same parasite as one which Celli and Guarnieri had reported (in an earlier paper) as having been found in the blood of human malaria patients. Specialists were agreed that this latter parasite could only have been the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite. The name *immaculata* Grassi, 1891, could not however be held to apply to that species, since Grassi's description of his *immaculata* was drawn exclusively from the avian parasite.

(g) In 1891 also, Celli and Sanfelice had published a paper in which they treated all the human malaria parasites as a single species, which they cited under the name *Plasmodium malariae* Marchiafava & Celli. This combined species was then discussed under three heads, according to the type of fever which it produced. To each of the three varieties so distinguished, these authors applied a Latin term consisting of an adjective in the feminine genitive singular (i.e. in grammatical agreement with the specific trivial name *malariae* Marchiafava & Celli). The terms so used were *quartanae* (for the Quartan Malaria Parasite, *tertianae* (for the Benign Tertian Malaria Parasite), and *quotidianae* (for the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite). These terms could not, by reason of the way in which they were formed, be regarded as having status as subspecific trivial names as from the date on which they were so published.

(h) It was in 1891 also that Danilewsky had published a paper on malaria parasites, the nomenclature used in which was so obscure and inconsistent that later (in *Opinion* 101) the Commission had ruled that new names published in it possessed no status in zoological nomenclature. It was therefore not necessary to consider in detail the trivial name *hominis*, published by Danilewsky in the binominal combination *Laverania hominis.*

(i) Kruse in 1892 had treated all the human malaria parasites as a single species, to which he applied the name *Plasmodium malariae*, which he divided into three forms for which he used Latin adjectives in the feminine genitive singular (in grammatical agreement with the specific trivial name *malariae* in the same way as Celli and Sanfelice had done in their paper of 1891 (see (g) above)). The terms so used by Kruse and the species for which they were used were :—*tertianae,* for the Benign Tertian Malaria Parasite; *quartanae,* for the Quartan Malaria Parasite; *irregularis,* for the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite. As in the case of the corresponding terms previously used by Celli and Sanfelice, the foregoing terms used by Kruse could not be regarded as having acquired status as subspecific trivial names as from the date on which they were so published by that author.

(j) In 1894 Labbé had published a paper in which he also treated all the known human malaria parasites as constituting a single species, which he placed in the genus *Haemamoeba* and to which he applied the new specific trivial name *laverani*. After describing this species Labbé had stated that it had two varieties, namely *quartana* (the Quartan Malaria Parasite) and *tertiana* (the Benign Tertian Malaria Parasite). Labbé's treatment of these species, though superficially similar to that adopted previously, first by Celli and Sanfelice, and second by Kruse, was in fact quite different from that of either. He definitely treated the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite as representing the species with which he was concerned and attached to it as varieties the two other human malaria parasites, giving to each a properly formed trivial name consisting of an adjective in the nominative singular. The terms *tertiana* Labbé and *quartana* Labbé were both properly formed trivial names, each possessing rights under the Law of Priority.

(k) In 1895 Thayer and Hewitson had published the trivial name *falciforme* (in the binominal combination *Haematozoon falciforme*) for the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite. This name, although published in the above authors' well-known work the "Malarial Fevers of Baltimore", had for some unaccountable reason been completely neglected, in spite of its having been actually referred to by Welch (1897) when he published the name *falciparum* (see (m) below).

(l) Lewkowicz (1897) had published an analysis of the various types of human malaria parasites, using, for this purpose an entirely new terminology. In the first place he introduced the new generic name *Haemosporidium*; in the second, he employed five terms, all adjectives in the feminine genitive singular, namely: *tertianae*, *quartanae*, *undecimanae*, *sexdecimanae*, and *vigesimo-tertianae*. The first of these terms applied to the Benign Tertian Malaria Parasite, the second to the Quartan Malaria Parasite, and the remainder to various forms of the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite. The fact that these terms were all adjectives in the feminine genitive singular made it clear that they must be in grammatical agreement with some feminine noun, such as "febris" or (the non-classical) "malaria", understood, though not expressed, which, if expressed, would have appeared as "febris" or "malariae".

It was evident that these terms were not used by Lewkowicz as subspecific trivial names and they could not therefore be accepted as such as from the date on which they were published by that author.

(m) In 1897 Welch had published the trivial name *falciparum* (in the binominal combination *Haematozoon falciparum*) for the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite.

(n) In addition to the names discussed above, there were two other names which it had sometimes been alleged had been given to the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite during the last decade of the XIXth century. These were: (i) the trivial name *irregularis* alleged to have been published by Sakharov in 1892 as a subspecific trivial name in the trinominal combination *Haemamoeba febris irregularis*; (ii) the trivial name *tropica* alleged to have been published by Koch in 1899 in the binominal combination *Plasmodium tropica.* The most careful search of the literature had failed to trace either of these names, and, for the reasons explained in the paper now before the Commission, he (the Acting President) believed that neither of these names had in fact ever been published by the authors concerned.

(4) From the foregoing survey it was clear (a) that the oldest available and therefore the valid, trivial name for the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite was *malariae* Laveran, 1881 (as published in the binominal combination *Oscillaria malariae*), (b) that the following trivial names were synonyms of the name *malariae* Laveran, 1881: *malariae* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885 (as published in the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*); *falciforme* Antolisei & Angelini, 1890 (as published in the binominal combination *Ematozoo falciforme*); *laverani* Labbé, 1894 (as published in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba laverani*); *falciforme* Thayer & Hewitson, 1895 (as published in the binominal combination *Haematozoon falciforme*); *falciparum* Welch, 1897 (as published in the binominal combination *Haematozoon falciparum*); (c) that the following trivial names which had been applied by some authors to the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite were not properly applicable thereto having been given by their original authors to avian parasites: *praecox* Grassi & Feletti, 1890 (as published in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba praecox*); *immaculata* Grassi, 1890 (as published in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba immaculata*); (d)

that the following terms which had been treated by some authors as having been published by their original authors as trivial names for the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite had in fact not been published as trivial names and possessed no status under the *Règles* : *quotidianae* Celli & Sanfelice 1891 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*) ; *irregularis* Kruse, 1892 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*) ; *undecimanae*, *sexdecimanae*, and *vigesimo-tertianae* Lewkowicz, 1897 (as published in connection with the generic name *Haemosporidium*) ; (e) that the alleged trivial names *irregularis* Sakharov, 1892 (as reputed to have been published in the trinominal combination *Haemamoeba febris irregularis*) and *tropica* Koch, 1899 (as reputed to have been published in the binominal combination *Plasmodium tropica*) had in fact never been so published by the authors concerned and therefore that these names were mere cheironyms. As regards the Quartan Malaria Parasite, it was now clear (a) that the earliest trivial name to be given to this species was *malariae* Feletti & Grassi, 1889 (as published in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba malariae*) ; (b) that the only other trivial name given to this species was the name *quartana* Labbé, 1894 (as published in the trinominal combination *Hamamoeba laverani* var. *quartana*) ; (c) that the following terms which had been treated by some authors as having been published by their original authors as trivial names for the Quartan Malaria Parasite had in fact not been published as trivial names and possessed no status under the *Règles* : *quartanae* Celli & Sanfelice, 1891 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*) ; *quartanae* Kruse, 1892 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*) ; *quartanae* Lewkowicz, 1897 (as published in connection with the generic name *Haemosporidium*). The trivial name *malariae* Feletti & Grassi, 1889, had been not only the oldest, but also the valid, trivial name for the Quartan Malaria Parasite at the time when it was first published ; it had become invalid however as soon as that species and the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite (*malariae* Laveran, 1881) had been united by specialists in a single genus. For it then became a junior secondary homonym of *malariae* Laveran and as such, had to be rejected permanently. Accordingly, the valid trivial name for the Quartan Malaria Parasite was the next name to have been given to that species, namely *quartana* Labbé, 1894. Turning to the Benign Tertian Malaria Parasite, the position was now seen to be : (a) that the oldest, and the valid, trivial name of this species was *vivax* Grassi & Feletti, 1890; (b) that the trivial name *tertiana* Labbé, 1894 (as published in the trinominal combination *Haemamoeba laverani* var. *tertiana*) was a synonym of *vivax* Grassi & Feletti, 1890; (c) that the following terms which had been treated by some authors as having been published by their original authors as trivial names for the Benign Tertian Malaria Parasite had in fact not been published as trivial names and possessed no status under the *Règles*: *tertianae* Celli & Sanfelice, 1891 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*); *tertianae* Kruse, 1892 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*); *tertianae* Lewkowicz, 1897 (as published in connection with the generic name *Haemosporidium*).

(5) On turning from the trivial names bestowed upon the human malaria parasites to the generic names published for those species, a situation of equal confusion was found to exist. The position as regards these names was as follows:—

(a) *Oscillaria* Schrank, 1823 or *Oscillaria* Laveran, 1881: Laveran had used the generic name *Oscillaria* when he first named the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite, giving to that species the name *Oscillaria malariae*. Laveran had not then stated whether he regarded this as a new generic name but the fact that he was certainly aware of the existence of Schrank's *Oscillaria* and that later without explanation he had dropped the name *Oscillaria* as the generic name for the human malaria parasites (which he would have been unlikely to have done if he had regarded himself as the author of the name) strongly pointed to the conclusion that, when in 1881 he applied this generic name to his new malaria parasite, he regarded himself as making use of the genus *Oscillaria* Schrank. The possibility could not however be excluded that he regarded himself as the author of this name. In either case, the generic name *Oscillaria* was invalid, as applied to the human malaria parasites. The species included by Schrank in 1823 in his genus *Oscillaria* were now known to have been not animals but minute species of algae. The genus had accordingly been transferred to the Vegetable Kingdom. In these circumstances, it could not be applicable to the human malaria parasites, none of those species having been included by Schrank in that genus at the time when he published the name *Oscillaria*. Under Article 1 of the *Règles*, a name, on being transferred from the Animal

Kingdom to the Vegetable Kingdom retained its rights in the Animal Kingdom; in consequence, the name *Oscillaria* Laveran, 1881, if such a name had ever in fact been published by that author, would have been invalid under Article 34, for it would have been a junior homonym of the name *Oscillaria* Schrank, 1823.

(b) *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885: As had already been shown (in (3) (b) above), the genus *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885, was a monotypical genus with *Plasmodium malariae* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885, as type species, that species being the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite. This genus had been universally accepted as having *Oscillaria malariae* Laveran, 1881, as its type species and that species had been accepted equally universally as being the Quartan Malaria Parasite. These errors dated from the authoritative but totally incorrect statements made first by Luhe (1900) and subsequently by Schaudinn (1902). It was impossible to believe that these great authorities could unwittingly have fallen into such an error. The only reasonable (or indeed possible) explanation was to conclude that first Luhe and later Schaudinn realised something which had never been realised by any previous worker, namely that there were two fatal flaws in the currently accepted nomenclature of the human malaria parasites, the correction of which would throw the entire literature of malariology into confusion. The errors in question were:—(1) The sole included species, and therefore the type species, of the genus *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885, was not the Quartan Malaria Parasite, as then universally supposed, but the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite; in consequence for all workers who regarded these two species as generically distinct from one another, *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli was the correct generic name for the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite; the universally used name *Laverania* (as attributed to Grassi & Feletti, 1890) was no more than a synonym of *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, the two genera having the same species as type species, while another generic name (*Haemamoeba*, as attributed to Grassi & Feletti, 1890) would need to replace *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli as the generic name of the Quartan Malaria Parasite. (2) The union of the Quartan

Malaria Parasite and the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite in a single genus (*Plasmodium*) would mean for every worker who accepted that taxonomic view that the trivial name *malariae* (as attributed to Grassi & Feletti, 1890), then universally in use for the Quartan Malaria Parasite would have to be rejected as a junior secondary homonym of the trivial name *malariae* Laveran, 1881, which was the oldest (and the valid) name for the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite, although it was not at that time used by any worker for that species, which was then generally known either by the nomenclatorially inapplicable name *praecox* Grassi & Feletti or by the similarly inapplicable name *immaculata* Grassi, 1891. Many years were to pass before a dilemma such as that which confronted Luhe and Schaudinn could be overcome by the use by the Commission of their plenary powers, for it was not until 1913 that those powers were conferred on them by the International Congress of Zoology. In these circumstances the confusion which Luhe and Schaudinn rightly anticipated would result from a strict application of the *Règles* to the names of the human malaria parasites could only be avoided by a deliberate evasion of the *Règles*. The existing nomenclatorial practice could be given the appearance of compliance with the *Règles* only if the interpretation of the literature was deliberately falsified in two respects : (1) by claiming that it was the Quartan Malaria Parasite and not the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite which Marchiafava & Celli had in 1885 included in the genus *Plasmodium* as sole species ; (2) by claiming that it was the Quartan Malaria Parasite and not the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite on which Laveran in 1881 had bestowed the trivial name *malariae*. Once these two claims had been successfully advanced, the name *malariae* Laveran, 1881, would remain the oldest available, and therefore the valid, trivial name of the Quartan Malaria Parasite, and the generic name *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli would in all circumstances be the correct name for the Quartan Malaria Parasite, irrespective of the view taken on taxonomic grounds on the question whether that species was congeneric with the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite. Neither of these claims had ever been advanced before but both these claims were now put forward first by Luhe and later by Schaudinn. The great authority of these workers, coupled with the disinclination of many workers to examine for themselves nomenclatorial problems on which the greatest living authorities had made categorical pronouncements, was sufficient to win immediate and universal acceptance for the views which they had expressed in this matter. This therefore was the reason that for nearly forty years a totally incorrect nomenclature had been—and still was—in universal use by malariologists.

(c) The cheironym *Haematomonas* Osler, 1886 : Some authors had cited Osler as having published in 1886 a generic name *Haematomonas* for the human malaria parasites. This was a complete misunderstanding of what Osler had written. All that he had said was that, pending a better understanding of the affinities of the human malaria parasites, it would be well, as had been suggested by Mitrophanow, to refer these species to the genus *Haematomonas*. This was not the first time that this name had been published and should therefore not be attributed to Osler, this name having already been published by Mitrophanow in 1883 for certain flagellates which were not human malaria parasites. The name *Haematomonas* was therefore not correctly applicable to the latter species.

(d) *Hämatophyllum* Metschnikoff, 1887 : This name was published quite unnecessarily as a *nom. nov. pro Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885, of which therefore it was an objective junior synonym.

(e) *Haemamoeba* Feletti & Grassi, 1889, and *Laverania* Feletti & Grassi, 1889 : These names (which were usually wrongly treated as having been published in 1890 and attributed to Grassi & Feletti instead of to Feletti & Grassi) were established by their authors as the names of monotypical genera, the first for the Quartan Malaria Parasite (then given the name *Haemamoeba malariae* Feletti & Grassi), the second for the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite (there referred to under the trivial name *malariae*, which was no doubt identified by these authors with *malariae* Laveran, 1881, in view of the fact that they selected that authority's name as the basis for their new generic name).

(f) *Ematozoo* Antolisei & Angelini, 1890 : This was a monotypical genus, having as its type species *Ematozoo falciforme* Antolisei & Angelini, 1890, a nominal species identified with the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite.

(g) *Cytamoeba*, *Cytosporon*, *Haemocytosporon*, and *Cytozoon* Danilewsky, 1891: All these generic names had been declared unavailable nomenclatorially by the Commission in their *Opinion* 101.

(h) *Haematozoon* Thayer & Hewitson, 1895: This also was a monotypical genus, its type species being *Haematozoon falciforme* Thayer & Hewitson, 1895, which had been identified as the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite.

(i) *Haemosporidium* Lewkowicz, 1897: Lewkowicz included in this genus all three of the human malaria parasites then discovered, treating them all as varieties of a single species, which however was not itself cited by him under a trivial name. No type species was designated for this genus by Lewkowicz and no later author had selected as the type species of the genus any of the three taxonomic species included by Lewkowicz in the single composite species recognised by that author but not cited by him under a trivial name. The second of the varieties recognised by Lewkowicz and denominated by him under the technical designation *quartanae* was, in fact, it was agreed by specialists, the Quartan Malaria Parasite. In order to assign a definite status to the generic name *Haemosporidium* Lewkowicz, he (the Acting President) had himself, in the paper now before the Commission, selected *Haemamoeba malariae* Feletti & Grassi, 1889, as the type species of the genus *Haemosporidium* Lewkowicz, 1897, making it an objective synonym of *Haemamoeba* Feletti & Grassi, 1889, of which the same species is the type species.

(6) The information so assembled showed that the generic name *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885, was an available name (in the sense that it was not a homonym of any previously published generic name), that its type species was a nominal species (*Plasmodium malariae* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885), which was subjectively identified with *Oscillaria malariae* Laveran, 1881, and that it was the oldest generic name having as its type species either the species so named by Laveran or a nominal species subjectively identified therewith. It was therefore the oldest available generic name for the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite. The generic name *Hämatophyllum* Metschnikoff, 1887, was an objective synonym of *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli and the names of the following genera were subjective synonyms of that generic name,

their respective type species being subjective synonyms of the nominal species that was the type species of the genus *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli :—*Laverania* Feletti & Grassi, 1889 ; *Ematozoo* Antolisei & Angelini, 1890 ; *Haematozoon* Thayer & Hewitson, 1895. The Quartan Malaria Parasite (*Haemomoeba malariae* Feletti & Grassi 1889) was the type species of the genus *Haemamoeba* Feletti & Grassi, 1889, and this, being an available name, was the correct generic name for the Quartan Malaria Parasite for any specialist who regarded that species as generically distinct from the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite (the type species of the genus *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli). The genus *Haemosporidium* Lewkowicz, 1897, was an objective synonym of *Haemamoeba* Feletti & Grassi, 1889, the same nominal species being the type species of both genera. The Benign Tertian Malaria Parasite was not the type species of any genus, but, as it was regarded by all workers as congeneric with the Quartan Malaria Parasite, its correct generic name for any given specialist was the name of whatever genus (either *Haemamoeba* Feletti & Grassi, 1889, or *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli) was accepted by that worker as the genus to which on taxonomic grounds the Quartan Malaria Parasite should be referred.

(7) Having now established what under the *Règles* were the correct generic and trivial names for the human malaria parasites, it was at length possible to compare those names with the names in universal use (which were also the names entered on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " in *Opinion* 104). This comparison showed the following results :—

Vernacular name of human malaria parasite	*Correct scientific name under the " Regles "*	*Scientific name universally in use (also the name recognised in " Opinion " 104)*
(1) Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite		
(a) For workers who regard this species as congeneric with the Quartan Malaria Parasite	*Plasmodium malariae* (Laveran, 1881)	*Plasmodium falciparum* (Welch, 1897)
(b) For workers who regard this species and the Quartan Malaria Parasite as belonging to different genera		*Laverania falciparum* (Welch, 1897)

Vernacular name of human malaria parasite	*Correct scientific name under the "Regles"*	*Scientific name universally in use (also the name recognised in "Opinion" 104)*
(2) Quartan Malaria Parasite		
(a) For workers who regard this species as congeneric with the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite	*Plasmodium quartanum* (Labbé, 1894)	*Plasmodim malariae* (Laveran, 1881)
(b) For workers who regard this species and the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite as belonging to different genera	*Haemamoeba quartanum* (Labbé, 1894)	
(3) Benign Tertian Malaria Parasite (treated by all specialists as congeneric with the Quartan Malaria Parasite)		
(a) For workers who regard the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite and the Quartan Malaria Parasite as congeneric	*Plasmodium vivax* (Grassi and Feletti, 1890)	*Plasmodium vivax* (Grassi and Feletti, 1890)
(b) For workers who regard the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite and the Quartan Malaria Parasite as belonging to different genera	*Haemamoeba vivax* (Grassi and Feletti, 1890)	

(8) It was obvious from the foregoing analysis that the gravest confusion would arise in the literature of malariology, if the *Règles* were to be strictly applied to the names of human malaria parasites, involving, as this would, among other changes (i) the transfer of the trivial name *malariae* from the Quartan Malaria Parasite (for which it was invariably used but to which it did not properly belong) to the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite (to which it correctly belonged but for which it was never used), and (ii) the acceptance (equally confusing) of the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite instead of the Quartan Malaria Parasite as the type species of theg enus *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli. All specialists were agreed in asking the Commission to use their plenary powers to prevent these disastrous changes from becoming necessary. The first could be achieved by suppressing the trivial name *malariae* Laveran, 1881, altogether, and by validating the trivial name *malariae* Feletti & Grassi, 1889, for the Quartan Malaria Parasite; the second could be achieved by the Commission

using their plenary powers to set aside the existing type designation for the genus *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli and by the Commission itself designating *Haemamoeba malariae* Feletti & Grassi, 1889, to be the type species of this genus. In order to validate the use of the trivial name *falciparum* Welch, 1897, it would be necessary to suppress all trivial names given to the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite subsequent to the name *malariae* Laveran, 1881 (which, as indicated above, it would be necessary in any case to suppress for the purpose of enabling the trivial name *malariae* to be used for the Quartan Malaria Parasite) and prior to the publication of the name *falciparum* Welch. He (the Acting President) recommended that advantage should be taken of the present opportunity to suppress, or, as the case might be, to declare invalid or inapplicable or non-existent all the names bestowed upon the human malaria parasites up to the end of the XIXth century which had been examined in the study placed before the Commission, other than the names now proposed to be validated. The names published by Danilewsky in 1891 had already been declared unavailable under *Opinion* 101. Turning to procedural questions, the Acting President said that it would be necessary (i) to cancel the incorrect statements regarding the generic names *Plasmodium* and *Laverania* contained in *Opinion* 104 and the consequent incorrect particulars regarding those names in the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology", (ii) to insert in that "Official List" amended particulars regarding the foregoing generic names, (iii) to insert entries in the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" and in the corresponding "Index" of rejected and invalid specific trivial names recording the decisions taken to suppress or to declare invalid, inapplicable or non-existent the names now recommended to be so suppressed or so declared, and (iv) to place on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" the correct trivial names as now stabilised for the three species of human malaria parasites under consideration.

(9) He (the Acting President) regretted that it had been necessary to burden the Commission with such a mass of detail, but, as they would have realised, this was unavoidable in even the most condensed presentation of the present case, if that presentation was to deal with each of the individual problems involved. It was difficult to imagine an application for the use of the plenary powers of greater importance than that now submitted or one which would be more widely supported by authoritative opinion in all parts of the world. He (the Acting President) therefore

confidently placed this application before the Commission for their approval.

(10) Finally, he (the Acting President) wished to express his thanks for the valuable advice and great assistance and encouragement which, while preparing the present application, he had received from leading protozoologists and other interested specialists. In particular, he desired to acknowledge the help received from Sir Rickard Christophers (Cambridge University, Cambridge), Brigadier J. A. Sinton (War Office, London), Dr. C. M. Wenyon (The Wellcome Research Institution, London), Professor Robert L. Usinger (University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.), Dr. Curtis W. Sabrosky (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.), Dr. C. Robert Coatney (United States Public Health Service, National Institute of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, U.S.A.), and Dr. C. F. W. Muesebeck (United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.), the last two of whom had been so kind as to furnish photostat copies of rare Italian papers on the malaria parasites, originals of which were not available in London.

IN THE DISCUSSION which ensued, the view was expressed on all hands that it was the clear duty of the Commission to use their plenary powers in the manner proposed, in order to prevent the catastrophic confusion not only in the systematic literature of Protozoa but also—and, in this case this was of much greater importance—in the vast medical and technical literature of malariology. The Secretary to the Commission was congratulated upon the masterly fashion in which he had assembled the complex mass of data which it was necessary to consider in order to determine the correct position as it existed under the *Règles*.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) to cancel the incorrect particulars relating to the generic names *Plasmodium* and *Laverania* contained :—
    - (a) in *Opinion* 104 ;
    - (b) in consequence of (a) above, in the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;
- (2) to use their plenary powers :—
    - (a) to suppress for all purposes the undermentioned trivial names published for the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite:—
        - *malariae* Laveran, 1881 (as published in the binominal combination *Oscillaria malariae*)

malariae Marchiafava & Celli, 1885 (as published in the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*)

malariae Feletti & Grassi, 1889 (as published in the binominal combination *Laverania malariae*) (in so far as this was published as a new name and not as the trivial name *malariae* Laveran, 1881) ;

(b) to suppress for all purposes other than Article 35 the undermentioned trivial names published for the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite :—

falciforme Antolisei & Angelini, 1890 (as published in the binominal combination *Ematozoo falciforme*)

laverani Labbé, 1894 (as published in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba laverani*)

falciforme Thayer & Hewitson, 1895 (as published in the binominal combination *Haematozoon falciforme*) ;

(c) to set aside the indication, by monotypy, of *Plasmodium malariae* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885 (the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite) as the type species (i) of the genus *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885, and (ii) of the genus *Hämatophyllum* Metschnikoff, 1887 (the name of which was published as a substitute name (*nom. nov.*) for *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885, in the erroneous belief that that name was not available under the *Règles*), and in place of the foregoing species to designate *Haemamoeba malariae* Feletti & Grassi, 1889 (the Quartan Malaria Parasite) to be the type species both of the genus *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885, and of the genus *Hämatophyllum* Metschnikoff, 1887 ;

(d) to validate the undermentioned trivial names :—

malariae Feletti & Grassi, 1889 (as published in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba malariae*) to be the name of the Quartan Malaria Parasite, notwithstanding the fact that, prior to the suppression under the plenary powers of the trivial names consisting of the word " malariae ", specified in (a) above, that name had been an invalid secondary homonym ;

falciparum Welch, 1897 (as published in the binominal combination *Haematozoon falciparum*) to be the name of the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite ;

(e) to set aside the indication, by monotypy, of *Laverania malariae* Feletti & Grassi, 1889, or, as the case may be, *Oscillaria malariae* Laveran, 1881, (being names for the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite suppressed under (a) above) as the type species of the genus *Laverania* Feletti & Grassi, 1889, and in the place of the species so named to designate *Haematozoon falciparum* Welch, 1897, to be the type species of that genus ;

(f) to validate the generic name *Laverania* Feletti & Grassi, 1889 (type species, by designation under the plenary powers, under (e) above : *Haematozoon falciparum* Welch, 1897, validated under the plenary powers, under (d) above, as the name of the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite) ;

(3) to declare the undermentioned generic names to be invalid or not required for the reasons severally stated below against the names in question :—

Generic name (1)	*Reason why generic name cited in Col.* (1) *is invalid or not required* (2)
Oscillaria Laveran, 1881 (in so far as Laveran published this as a new name and not as *Oscillaria* Schrank, 1823)	Invalid because a homonym of *Oscillaria* Schrank, 1823, that name retaining under Article 1 its right under Article 34, notwithstanding the fact that the genus so named has been transferred to the Vegetable Kingdom

Hämatophyllum Metschnikoff, 1887	Invalid because an objective synonym of *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885, the two nominal genera having the same nominal species as type species
Haemamoeba Feletti & Grassi, 1889	Invalid because the type species of this genus (*Haemamoeba malariae* Feletti & Grassi, 1889) has, under (2) (c) above, been designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of the genus having the older name *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885
Ematozoo Antolisei & Angelini, 1890	Not required because its type species (*Ematozoo falciforme* Antolisei & Angelini, 1890) is a subjective synonym of *Haematozoon falciparum* Welch, 1897, designated under the plenary powers, under (2) (f) above, to be the type species of the genus *Laverania* Feletti & Grassi, 1889 ;
Haematozoon Thayer & Hewitson, 1895	Not required because its type species (*Haematozoon falciforme* Thayer & Hewitson, 1895) is a subjective synonym of *Haematozoon falciparum* Welch, 1897, designated under the plenary powers, under (2) (f) above, to be the type species of the genus *Laverania* Feletti & Grassi, 1889 ;

Haemosporidium Lewkowicz, 1897	Invalid because its type species, *Haemamoeba malariae* Feletti & Grassi, 1889 (by selection under Article 30, Rule (g) and *Opinion* 35) is the same nominal species as that which, under the plenary powers, has, under (2) (c) above, been designated as the type species of the genus having the older name *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885

(4) to declare that the undermentioned trivial names, each of which was published as the name of a new avian parasite but in the description of each of which there appeared an incorrect statement that the parasite in question had been found in the blood of human malaria patients, were not available as trivial names for the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite (the parasite misidentified with the avian parasite concerned), these trivial names adhering under the *Règles* to the avian parasites, from which the original descriptions of these parasites were drawn up by their respective authors :—

praecox Grassi & Feletti, 1890 (as published in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba praecox*)

immaculata Grassi, 1891 (as published in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba immaculata*)

(5) to declare that the undermentioned terms consisting of Latin adjectives published in the genitive case, in agreement not with the generic name (as required by Article 14(1)(a)) but with the specific trivial name, either expressed or understood, were published not as subspecific trivial names of human malaria parasites, but as technical designations for those species and that the Latin adjectives in question accordingly possess no status under the *Règles* as subspecific trivial names :—

quartanae Celli & Sanfelice, 1891 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*)

tertianae Celli & Sanfelice, 1891 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*)

quotidianae Celli & Sanfelice, 1891 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*)

tertianae Kruse, 1892 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*)

quartanae Kruse, 1892 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*)

irregularis Kruse, 1892 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*)

tertianae Lewkowicz, 1897 (as published in connection with the generic name *Haemosporidium*)

quartanae Lewkowicz, 1897 (as published in connection with the generic name *Haemosporidium*)

undecimanae Lewkowicz, 1897 (as published in connection with the generic name *Haemosporidium*)

sexdecimanae Lewkowicz, 1897 (as published in connection with the generic name *Haemosporidium*)

vigesimo-tertianae Lewkowicz, 1897 (as published in connection with the generic name *Haemosporidium*);

(6) to place on record :—

(a) that there was no such generic name as *Haematomonas* Osler, 1886, Osler in the passage in question not having published a new generic name but having referred to the previously published name *Haematomonas* Mitrophanow, 1883 ;

(b) that the undermentioned generic and trivial names published for human malaria parasites by Danilewsky, 1891, possessed no status under the *Règles*, the paper in which they were published having been declared by the Commission in *Opinion* 101 to be unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes :—

(i) the generic names :—

Cytamoeba Danilewsky, 1891
Cytosporon Danilewsky, 1891
Cytozoon Danilewsky, 1891
Haemocytosporon Danilewsky, 1891

(ii) the trivial name *hominis* Danilewsky, 1891 (as published in the binominal combination *Laverania hominis*);

(c) that the trivial name *quartana* Labbé, 1894 (as published as a subspecific trivial name in the trinominal combination *Haemamoeba laverani* var. *quartana*), is not required for the Quartan Malaria Parasite, it being a junior subjective synonym of the trivial name *malariae* Feletti & Grassi 1889 (as published in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba malariae*) validated under the plenary powers under (2) (d) above ;

(d) that the undermentioned alleged trivial names, not having been published, were cheironyms and accordingly possessed no status under the *Règles* :—

irregularis Sakharov, 1892 (erroneously alleged to have been published as a subspecific trivial name in the trinominal combination *Haemamoeba febris irregularis*)

tropica Koch, 1899 (erroneously alleged to have been published in the binominal combination *Plasmodium tropica*) ;

(7) to declare that the trivial name *vivax* Grassi & Feletti, 1890 (as published in the binonimal combination *Haemamoeba vivax*) is the oldest available trivial name for, and therefore the valid trivial name of, the Benign Tertian Malaria Parasite ;

(8) to declare that the trivial name *tertiana* Labbé, 1894 (as published as a subspecific trivial name in the trinominal combination *Haemamoeba laverani* var. *tertiana*) is not required for the Benign Tertian Malaria Parasite, being a subjective synonym of the earlier published trivial name *vivax* Grassi & Feletti, 1890 ;

(9) to substitute the following particulars in regard to the generic names *Plasmodium* and *Laverania* in the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " in place of the particulars deleted therefrom in accordance with (1) above :—

Plasmodium Marchiafava & Celli, 1885 (type species by designation under the plenary powers : *Haemamoeba malariae* Feletti & Grassi, 1889) (the Quartan Malaria Parasite) ;

Laverania Feletti & Grassi, 1889 (type species, by designation under the plenary powers : *Haematozoon falciparum* Welch, 1897) (the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite) (generic name to be used by authors who consider the Malignant Tertian (or Aestivo-Autumnal) Malaria Parasite to be generically distinct from the Quartan Malaria Parasite) ;

(10) to place the undermentioned generic names and alleged generic names on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " :—

Cytamoeba Danilewsky, 1891 (a name possessing no status under the *Règles*, the Commission having ruled (*Opinion* 101) that the paper in which it was published is not available for nomenclatorial purposes)

Cytosporon Danilewsky, 1891 (a name possesing no status under the *Règles*, the Commission having ruled (*Opinion* 101) that the paper in which it was published is not available for nomenclatorial purposes)

Cytozoon Danilewsky, 1891 (a name possessing no status under the *Règles*, the Commission having ruled (*Opinion* 101) that the paper in which it was published is not available for nomenclatorial purposes)

Haemamoeba Feletti & Grassi, 1889 (invalid because an objective synonym of *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885, as defined under the plenary powers in (2) (c) above, but available for the purposes of Article 34)

Haematomonas Osler, 1886 (a cheironym based upon a misreading of a passage referring to the generic name *Haematomonas* Mitropharow, 1883)

Hämatophyllum Metschnikoff, 1887 (invalid because an objective synonym of *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885, but available for the purposes of Article 34)

Haemocytosporon Danilewsky, 1891 (a name possessing no status under the *Règles*, the Commission having ruled (*Opinion* 101) that the paper in which it was published is not available for nomenclatorial purposes)

Haemosporidium Lewkowicz, 1897 (invalid because an objective synonym of *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885, as defined under the plenary powers in (2) (c) above but available for the purposes of Article 34)

Oscillaria Laveran, 1881 (in so far as published by Laveran as a new name, invalid as a homonym of *Oscillaria* Schrank, 1823);

(11) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology":—

falciparum Welch, 1897 (as published in the binominal combination *Haematozoon falciparum*) (the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite)

malariae Feletti & Grassi, 1889 (as published in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba malariae*) (the Quartan Malaria Parasite)

vivax Grassi & Feletti, 1890 (as published in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba vivax*) (the Benign Tertian Malaria Parasite);

(12) to place the undermentioned trivial names and alleged trivial names on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology":—

falciforme Antolisei & Angelini, 1890 (as published in the binominal combination *Ematozoo falciforme*) (suppressed under the plenary powers, under (2) (b) above, for all purposes other than Article 35) *falciforme* Thayer & Hewitson, 1895 (as published in the binominal combination *Haematozoon falciforme*) (suppressed under the plenary powers, under (2) (b) above, for all purposes other than Article 35)

hominis Danilewsky, 1891 (as published in the binominal combination *Laverania hominis*) (a name possessing no status under the *Règles*, the Commission having ruled (*Opinion* 101) that the paper in which it was published is not available for nomenclatorial purposes)

immaculata Grassi, 1891 (as published in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba immaculata*) (not applicable to the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite, but available for the avian parasite, on which the description by the original author was based)

irregularis Kruse, 1892 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*) (published as a technical designation, not as a trivial name, and in consequence possessing no status under the *Règles*)

irregularis Sakharov (erroneously alleged to have been published in 1892 as a subspecific trivial name in the trinominal combination *Haemamoeba febris irregularis*) (a cheironym possessing no status under the *Règles*)

laverani Labbé, 1894 (as published in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba laverani*) (suppressed under the plenary powers for all purposes other than Article 35, under (2) (b) above)

malariae Feletti & Grassi, 1889 (as published in the binominal combination *Laverania malariae*) (in so far as this was a new name and not merely a use of the trivial name *malariae* Laveran, 1881) (suppressed for all purposes under the plenary powers under (2) (a) above) *malariae* Laveran, 1881 (as published in the binominal combination *Oscillaria malariae*) (suppressed for all purposes under the plenary powers under (2) (a) above)

malariae Marchiafava & Celli, 1885 (as published in the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*) (suppressed for all purposes under the plenary powers under (2) (a) above)

praecox Grassi & Feletti, 1890 (as published in the binominal combination *Haemămoeba praecox*) (not applicable to the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite, but available for the avian parasite, on which the description by the original authors was based)

quartanae Celli & Sanfelice, 1891 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*) (published as a technical designation, not as a trivial name, and in consequence possessing no status under the *Règles*)

quartanae Kruse, 1892 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*) (published as a technical designation, not as a trivial name, and in consequence possessing no status under the *Règles*)

quartanae Lewkowicz, 1897 (as published in connection with the generic name *Haemosporidium*) (published as a technical designation, not as a trivial name, and in consequence possessing no status under the *Règles*)

quotidianae Celli & Sanfelice, 1891 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*) (published as a technical designation, not as a trivial name, and in consequence possessing no status under the *Règles*)

sexdecimanae Lewkowicz, 1897 (as published in connection with the generic name *Haemos-*

poridium) (published as a technical designation, not as a trivial name, and in consequence possessing no status under the *Règles*)

tertianae Celli & Sanfelice, 1891 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*) (published as a technical designation, not as a trivial name, and in consequence possessing no status under the *Règles*)

tertianae Kruse, 1892 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*) (published as a technical designation, not as a trivial name, and in consequence possessing no status under the *Règles*)

tertianae Lewkowicz, 1897 (as published in connection with the generic name *Haemosporidium*) (published as a technical designation, not as a trivial name, and in consequence possessing no status under the *Règles*)

tropica Koch (erroneously alleged to have been published in 1899 as a specific trivial name in the binominal combination *Plasmodium tropica*) (a cheironym possessing no status under the *Règles*)

undecimanae Lewkowicz, 1897 (as published in connection with the generic name *Haemosporidium*) (published as a technical designation, not as a trivial name, and in consequence possessing no status under the *Règles*)

vigesimotertianae Lewkowicz, 1897 (as published in connection with the generic name *Haemosporidium*) (published as a technical designation, not as a trivial name, and in consequence possessing no status under the *Règles*);

(13) to place on record their grateful thanks to the protozoologists, bibliographers and other specialists who, by furnishing information and advice on systematic and bibliographical questions or by supplying photostat copies of rare papers needed in the course of the present investigation into the nomenclature of the human malaria parasites or otherwise, had contributed to the

successful elucidation of the complex problems involved ;

(14) to congratulate Secretary Hemming on the masterly fashion in which he had marshalled the evidence in the light of which the decisions now taken had been reached ;

(15) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (12) above.

Article 14(1)(a) : on term consisting of an adjective denoting a subspecies or infra-subspecific form of a species, whose trivial name is a noun in the genitive case, declared not to acquire status as a subspecific or infra-subspecific trivial name, if published in grammatical agreement not with the generic name but with the trivial name of the species, either expressed or understood

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 5)

60. Arising out of the decision recorded in Conclusion 59(5) above, that the terms *quartanae*, *tertianae*, etc., used by Celli and Sanfelice, 1891 (in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*), being adjectives in the genitive case in grammatical agreement not with the generic name (as required by Article 14(1) (a)) but with the specific trivial name *malariae* (a noun in the genitive case), were published as technical designations for the subspecies concerned and that this applied also to the same and other adjectives in grammatical agreement with a specific trivial name, consisting of a noun in the genitive case, understood but not expressed similarly used by Lewkowicz, 1897 (in connection with the generic name *Haemosporidium*) and therefore that the Latin adjectives so used possessed no status under the *Règles* as subspecific trivial names, THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to recommend that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear :—

(a) that the provision relating to the automatic correction of orthographical and other infringements of Articles 14-16, 18 and 20, which, at the meeting noted in the margin, it had been agreed to recommend should be inserted in the *Règles*, did not apply to a case where a subspecific or infra-subspecific form of a species, the trivial name of which consisted of a noun in the genitive case, was denoted by an adjective in grammatical agreement not with the generic name (as required by Article 14) but with the specific trivial name, either expressed or understood ;

(b) that an adjective used in the manner indicated in (a) above for the purpose of distinguishing a subspecies or infra-subspecific form did not acquire thereby the status of a subspecific, or infra-subspecific, trivial name ;

(2) to report to the Section on Nomenclature the recommendation specified in (1) above and the conclusions reached in regard to the nomenclature of the human malaria parasites, as recorded in Conclusion 59 above ;

(3) to invite the Acting President, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, forthwith to submit to the Section on Nomenclature the Report referred to in (2) above.

(*The Acting President thereupon submitted the foregoing Report to the Section on Nomenclature.*)

" Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology ": clarification of scope of, in certain respects

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 42)

61. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that there were two small points in connection with the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " on which further clarification was desirable. As this " List " was intended to provide a means for recording the trivial names of species, the nomenclature of which it was desired to stabilise, it would consist mainly of trivial names which had originally been published in binominal combinations. In some cases, however, it happened that the species the name of which it was desired to stabilise (for example because it was the type species of an important genus) had originally been described as a subspecies of some other species. In such a case the trivial name of the species concerned would be a name which had originally been published as a subspecific trivial name as part of a trinominal combination. Two such cases had been considered in the course of that evening's discussions, namely the type species of the genus *Euchloë* Hübner, [1819] (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) and the type species of *Brissus* Gray, 1825 (Class Echinoidea, Order Spatangoida). In each of these cases, the Commission had agreed that the trivial name in question should be placed on the " Official List ". This was clearly the right course. It was not absolutely clear, however, whether the existing decision in regard to this " Official List " covered this class of case. It was desirable therefore that it should be expressly placed on record that in such cases names originally published as subspecific trivial names were eligible for admission to this " Official List ". The second point was of a somewhat different kind : it would be remembered that, at the suggestion of Alternate Commissioner Beltrán it had been agreed, in concurrence with the Section on Nomenclature, that, where it was decided to stabilise the generic nomenclature of a given group of species by means of the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " but there was not full agreement among specialists as to whether more than one

(*Previous references: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusions* 24 *and* 36)

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 8th Meeting, Conclusion* 6)

genus should be recognised for taxonomic purposes, two or more names should be placed on the " Official List," subject to the insertion against the later published of the generic name or names in question of a note that the generic name concerned had been placed on the " Official List " for the benefit of those specialists who regarded the type species of the genus so named as generically distinct from the species which was the type species of the genus bearing the oldest of the generic names so placed on the " List ". A similar problem would sometimes arise in connection with the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology ", for the Commission would sometimes want to place on that " List " a trivial name which was regarded by some specialists as the trivial name of a species, but by others as the trivial name of a subspecies of some second species. It was desirable in this case also that it should be made clear in the provisions governing this " Official List " that, *mutatis mutandis*, the principles agreed upon (on the suggestion of Alternate Commissioner Beltrán) in the case of the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " applied also to the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology ".

IN THE DISCUSSION which followed, it was generally agreed that express provision should be made in the provisions governing the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " to meet the two classes of case to which the the Acting President had referred. The view was expressed however that, while this " Official List " was intended primarily for recording the trivial names of species, this should not be held to render ineligible for admission to this " List " trivial names, which all specialists were agreed were subspecific trivial names, in cases where, in the opinion of the Commission, there was some good reason why the trivial name in question should be stabilised in this way. This suggestion won general support and in consequence consideration was given to the question whether the title agreed upon for this " Official List " would require to be changed. Much discussion had already taken place at previous meetings in regard to the title to be given to this " Official List " and it was generally felt that the title that had finally been adopted was the most suitable that could be devised. The fact that names regarded by specialists as the trivial names not of species but of subspecies were now to be rendered eligible for admission to this " List " was in no way inconsistent with its present title, for from the nomenclatorial point of view, a specific trivial name differed in no way from a subspecific trivial name, the sole difference between the two classes of name being the subjective taxonomic view taken by specialists regarding the systematic status of the unit represented by the animal so named, that is, whether that unit should be regarded as a species or as a subspecies.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to recommend that it should be made clear in the provisions governing the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " that, in addition to trivial names which were both originally published as specific trivial names (i.e. as part of a binominal combination) and were also currently regarded by specialists as the trivial names of taxonomically valid species, the following classes of names should also be eligible for admission to the foregoing " Official List " :—

(a) trivial names originally published as the trivial names of subspecies but now regarded as the trivial names of species ;

(b) trivial names, whether originally published as specific trivial names or as subspecific trivial names, now regarded as subspecific trivial names ;

(2) to recommend that there should be added to the provisions governing the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " a provision prescribing that, where the Commission decided to place on the " Official List " a trivial name regarded as a specific trivial name by some specialists but by others as a subspecific trivial name :—

(a) a note should be inserted against the entry in the " Official List " to the trivial name in question that it had been placed on the said " Official List " without prejudice to the question whether it was a specific, or a subspecific, trivial name ; and that

(b) in such a case there should at the same time be placed on the " Official List " the trivial name of the species, of which, in the opinion of some specialists, the taxonomic unit bearing the other trivial name was a subspecies ;

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion 5(1)(a))

(3) that the extension of the scope of the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " specified in (1) and (2) above did not call for any change in the title which, at the meeting noted in

the margin, it had been agreed should be the title of the foregoing " Official List " ;

(4) to report to the Section on Nomenclature the recommendation in regard to the scope of the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " specified in (1) and (2) above and the conclusion in regard to the title to be given to that " Official List " specified in (3) above ;

(5) to invite the Acting President, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, forthwith to submit to the Section on Nomenclature the Report referred to in (4) above.

(*The Acting President thereupon submitted the foregoing Report to the Section on Nomenclature.*)

Editorial Committee charged with the duty of editing the revised text of the " Règles " : proposals submitted to the Section on Nomenclature in regard to the composition of

(*Previous references: Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusions* 5(1)(b) *and* (3))

62. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that at the meeting held that day in the forenoon the Commission, in agreement with the Section on Nomenclature, had agreed to substitute for the arrangements previously approved for the examination of the draft of the *Règles* as revised by the present Congress, when received from the jurists, and for the final settlement of any questions which might arise from that examination (including any questions which might be raised by Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners who had been in attendance during the Paris Session or, as respects drafting matters, by Commissioners who had not been in such attendance) an arrangement under which the foregoing duties would be assigned to an *ad hoc* Editorial Committee composed of three Commissioners, including, if so desired, Alternate Commissioners, who had been present throughout the Paris Congress. The question of the composition of this Editorial Committee was not a matter which could have been settled at that meeting and it had accordingly been decided that this question should be postponed for consideration at a meeting to be held later in the course of the same day. He (the Acting President) had now to report that in accordance with the request addressed to him at the morning meeting, he had held consultations during the day with leading European and American zoologists on the question of the proposals to be submitted in regard to the selection of the zoologists to be invited to serve on the Editorial Committee. There was general agreement that the membership of this Committee should consist of the Secretary to the Commission and of one European, and one American, member of the Commission. For the European seat, all agreed that it was desirable to secure the services of a zoologist, whose mother tongue was French but who was also thoroughly familiar with the English language, for this qualification would be of especial value in ensuring the closest comparison of the draft of the substantive French text of the *Règles* with the draft of the English translation of that text. The unanimous view of all the zoologists consulted was that this place should be offered to Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium) who had not only played an important part as an Alternate Member of the Commission, in the reform of the *Règles* agreed upon during the present Congress, and possessed in an outstanding measure the special qualifications required, but was also a zoologist of the highest distinction, whose appointment to the Editorial Committee would be generally acclaimed by European zoologists. Professor van Straelen was unfortunately detained by another engagement elsewhere but he had authorised him (the Acting President) to state that, if it was the general wish of the Commission that he should serve on the Editorial Committee, he would be willing to be nominated for election thereto. For the American seat on the Committee, the American zoologists consulted would have desired to nominate Professor J. Chester Bradley, the senior of the American members of the Commission attending the present Congress, but they realised that this was not practicable, in view of the arrangements made by Professor Chester Bradley to start an extensive tour of Africa shortly after the close of the Congress. The American zoologists accordingly proposed that the American seat on the Editorial Committee should be offered to Professor Robert L. Usinger, who, as an Alternate Member of the Commission, had attended all the meetings of the Commission at which the reform of the *Règles* had been under consideration and had himself played an outstanding part in the discussions leading to the decisions reached. Professor Usinger had indicated that, if so invited by the Commission, he would be willing to be nominated to serve on the Editorial Committee.

IN THE DISCUSSION which ensued, general satisfaction was expressed at the result of the consultations undertaken by the Acting President, the nominations suggested meeting with the approval of all present.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to nominate the undermentioned Members and Alternate Members of the Commission, who had been in attendance throughout the Paris Session, to be the members of the Editorial Committee charged with the duty of examining

the text, when received from the jurists, of the *Règles Internationales*, as revised by the present Congress, the appointment of which the Section on Nomenclature, in agreement with the Commission, had, at the meeting held in the forenoon of the same day, agreed to recommend for approval by the Congress at the final *Concilium Plenum* to be held on the following day (Tuesday, 27th July 1948):—

Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary to the Commission*)

Alternate Commissioner V. van Straelen (Belgium)

Alternate Commissioner Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.);

(2) to report the nominations specified in (1) above, to the Section on Nomenclature, with a request that they be approved and adopted, and with an intimation that, if the said nominations were so approved and adopted, it was the intention of the Commission, with the concurrence of the Section, to insert particulars of the membership of the Editorial Committee in the relevant paragraph of the Report to the Congress which they had themselves unanimously adopted earlier during the present day and which had subsequently been similarly approved and adopted by the Section for submission to the Congress in *Concilium Plenum*;

(3) to invite the Acting President, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, forthwith to submit to the Section on Nomenclature the Report referred to in (2) above.

(*The Acting President thereupon submitted the foregoing Report to the Section on Nomenclature.*)

Report to the Congress on work performed by the Commission during the Paris Session: concluding instalment submitted to the Section on Nomenclature

63. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that, in accordance with an arrangement made that morning, in agreement with the Section, he had at the close of the meeting held in the later part of that afternoon invited the Commission to submit a formal recommendation to the Section, then sitting jointly with the Commission, that the Section agree that the approval

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion* 6 (2))

(*Previous reference: 13th Meeting, Conclusion* 51))

of the recommendations and decisions reached by the Commission signified by the Section at the time when it had approved the Commission's Report to the Congress should be held to extend also to the recommendations and conclusions reached by the Commission at later meetings held jointly with the Section. The recommendations adopted and the conclusions reached by the Commission during the present meeting had all been reported to the Section on Nomenclature. All that was now necessary was therefore to invite the Section to extend to those recommendations and conclusions the approval which it had signified when approving the Report agreed upon by the Commission for submission to the Congress in *Concilium Plenum.* On the adoption by the Section of a proposal so submitted, all the necessary formal action would have been taken; every recommendation adopted, and every conclusion reached, by the Commission during their present Session would have been reported to the Section; every such recommendation would have been approved by the Section and covered by the Report submitted to the Congress by the Commission and the Section for approval in *Concilium Plenum.*

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to request the Section on Nomenclature, acting under the procedure agreed upon at the meeting held in the forenoon of the same day, to extend the approval then given to the recommendations and conclusions either specified in, or referred to in, the Report then submitted by the Commission for transmission to the Congress, to cover also the recommendations adopted, and the conclusions reached, by the Commission during their present (fourteenth) meeting and already reported by the Commission to the Section during the course of the said meeting, so that, when the foregoing Report was submitted to the Congress in *Concilium Plenum*, it should cover the entire field of the work performed by the Commission and the Section during the present Congress;

(2) to invite the Acting President, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, forthwith to submit to the Section on Nomenclature the request specified in (1) above.

(*The Acting President thereupon submitted the foregoing request to the Section on Nomenclature.*)

Decisions taken by the Commission in "Opinions" and other publications (method to be adopted for recording): consideration of resolution regarding, submitted on behalf of the Committee on Nomenclature of the Smithsonian Institution Washington, D.C.

64. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that earlier during the present Session Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.) had notified him that the Committee on Nomenclature of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. had requested him to submit to the Commission during its Session in Paris a Resolution on the subject of the procedure which, in the opinion of the Committee, was desirable should be followed in preparing texts recording decisions taken by the Commission. On receiving this intimation from Professor Usinger, he had at once assured him that before the close of the Paris Session he, as the Acting President, would provide an opportunity for Professor Usinger to bring forward his Resolution and for a full discussion to take place on the issues raised. He had added that in the meantime he would be much obliged if Professor Usinger would be good enough to furnish him with a copy of the Resolution which he desired to bring forward, so that he (the Acting President), in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission and therefore the Officer of the Commission responsible for the recording of decisions taken by the Commission, might have an opportunity of considering the points which it was desired to raise, before the discussion actually took place in the Commission. Professor Usinger had immediately acceded to this request and not long afterwards had handed in the terms of the proposed Resolution. This Resolution was headed: "Resolution submitted by R. L. Usinger for the Committee on Nomenclature of the Smithsonian Institution: J. Brookes Knight, C. W. Sabrosky, P. W. Oman, C. F. W. Muesebeck, F. A. Chase, and R. E. Blackwelder." He (the Acting President) now called upon Professor Usinger to read the Resolution which he had submitted and to make any supplementary explanations in regard thereto which he might wish to lay before the Commission.

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER ROBERT L. USINGER (U.S.A.) then read the following Resolution :—

> "It is of the utmost importance that all published statements of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature carry the full authority of the Commission. This authority can not be the same in the case of *Opinions* and other publications issued under the "agreement in principle" procedure inaugurated at the Lisbon meetings in 1935 as compared with previous *Opinions* which were actually seen and voted upon in their final form by the Commission.
>
> "Serious objections have been raised to the new procedure because of uncertainty as to whether or not the published wording carries the actual meaning of the points voted by the Commission. Now that the voting procedure has been liberalised it is even more important and at the same time easier to ensure that the formal stamp of approval be given to the actual wording of future publications of the Commission.

> "Accordingly it is proposed that in every case the final draft, or in cases where urgency is very great proof sheets of official actions of the Commission be submitted to the full Commission with a rigorous time limit and with authority vested in the Secretary to evaluate the resulting comments and judge whether they should (1) be adopted; (2) be rejected, or (3) be submitted again to the Commission for further consideration."

Alternate Commissioner Usinger then said that he hoped that the Commission as a body would not think that, in making this proposal, he and his colleagues were in any way opposed to the Commission or were seeking to place difficulties in its path. The reverse was the case. It was because he and those associated with him were firm supporters of international co-operation in the field of zoological nomenclature that they put forward the present proposal, desiring, as they did, to see the position of the Commission strengthened. This aim could, however, in their view, be attained only by the adoption of measures to ensure that the contribution to the work of the Commission actually made by its members was increased to the maximum not only during the meetings of the Congress but also—and especially—during inter-Congress periods. In order to achieve this end, it was desirable that the responsibilities and powers of the Secretary to the Commission should be circumscribed to the fullest extent possible and that that Officer should be given only so much discretion as was absolutely necessary to enable him to give effect to decisions previously taken by the Commission. Further, it was desirable that, so far as possible, the Secretary to the Commission should abstain from expressing in print even his personal views on questions of zoological nomenclature. For the publication of such views, even in papers which were clearly marked as personal contributions only, were liable to give rise to misunderstandings (as had happened in Washington in the case of the "Editorial Notes" attached by the Secretary to the reissues of the older Opinions), since views expressed by the holder of the high Office of Secretary to the Commission inevitably carried great weight, even if they were personal opinions only.

Concluding, Alternate Commissioner Usinger expressed the hope that, for the reasons which he had explained, the Commission would adopt the Resolution which he had proposed, and would accordingly instruct the Secretary to guide his work in future by the principles there laid down.

COMMISSIONER CHESTER BRADLEY (U.S.A.) said that all would agree that it was essential that the wording used in *Opinions* for recording decisions taken by the Commission should give full effect to the decision taken by the Commission, neither adding anything to it nor subtracting anything from it. This had always been the practice. There had been no change in this matter at Lisbon and no "agreement in principle" prodecure had then been adopted. The numerous decisions then taken in regard to individual names, many of them on proposals submitted by himself, had all been recorded in the Report then unanimously submitted by the Commission to the Congress; the *Opinions* subsequently published merely gave effect to the decisions reached at Lisbon. He thought it important—and he felt sure that this was also the view of Secretary Hemming—that during inter-Congress periods as close a touch as possible should be maintained between the Secretary's Office on the one hand and the other members of the Commission on the other. It was equally important however to realise the great difficulties involved in running the Secretariat of the Commission; the volume of work was very great and its despatch depended entirely upon the efforts of the Commission's spare-time Secretary. He felt confident that Secretary Hemming was fully as anxious as anyone to maintain and develop contacts between himself, as Secretary, and the other members of the Commission during inter-Congress periods. Any practicable proposal for assisting the Secretary in his efforts in this direction would win his (Commissioner Chester Bradley's) support, but he could not associate himself with a proposal such as that which had been brought forward which, if adopted, would introduce unnecessary additional difficulties in the work of the Secretariat, by unduly limiting the discretion of the Secretary. Even if the proposal submitted by Alternate Commissioner Usinger had itself been free from objection, he (Commissioner Chester Bradley) would have felt bound to dissociate himself from the words in which it had been presented to the Commission. It was wrong in principle to speak of instructions being issued by the Commission to their Secretary, such phraseology being altogether misplaced and unnecessarily harsh. He would however be prepared to give his support to any proposal designed to secure such closer contacts within the Commission as the members of the Commission, including the Secretary, might consider would be helpful. It was, he knew, the desire of the Secretary to foster such contacts and he would, he did not doubt, be willing to extend his existing practice in this matter to the full extent of his power.

COMMISSIONER L. DI CAPORIACCO (ITALY) said that he had no sympathy with the proposal submitted by Alternate Commissioner Usinger. As the permanent members of the Commission were well aware, the present arrangements for the drafting of *Opinions* made it perfectly clear what was the decision which had been taken by the Commission. No more could reasonably be required. For his part, he considered that the organisation of the Secretariat of the Commission was as good as could possibly be expected, having regard to the Commission's lack of funds and the fact that it had to rely entirely upon the efforts of its spare-time Secretary. The chief defect of the Commission throughout its history had been the extremely slow rate at which it worked. This was due not to any fault in the Secretariat but to the obsolete voting procedure with which the Commission had for so long unnecessarily burdened itself. Fortunately, this gratuitous handicap had been removed by the decision during the present Session to reform the voting procedure, a decision which, it might be hoped, would materially improve the efficiency with which the work of the Commission would in future be performed

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER E. BELTRÁN (MEXICO) associated himself with the views just expressed by Commissioner di Caporiacco.

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) said that he agreed—as indeed everyone was agreed––that it was desirable that, so far as might be practicable, the Secretary to the Commission should keep the other Commissioners in close touch with the work of the Commission during inter-Congress periods. On the other hand, it was necessary to pay due regard to the very great difficulties, on account both of lack of funds and of lack of time, which confronted the Secretary to the Commission, as a spare-time Officer, in dealing with the very large amount of work which passed through the Secretariat of the Commission. He was opposed therefore to any procedure which would delay the essential work of the Commission, without conferring any corresponding benefit. As regards the *Opinions* of the Commission, it was, of course, essential that each should contain clear evidence regarding the terms of the decision actually taken by the Commission. This was fully provided for under the existing procedure. In these circumstances, he could not regard the proposal now before the Commission for a change in procedure as being of any practical value. He could not therefore give it his support.

(*At this point further discussion took place in regard to the procedure to be adopted for securing the approval, by Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners who had been present during the Paris Congress, of the text* *of the Minutes of the Meetings held by the Commission during its Paris Session, when these were available. The record of this discussion and of the decision reached by the Commission is given in the next following Conclusion.*)

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS HEMMING (UNITED KINGDOM) (*Secretary to the Commission*) said that he had listened with close attention both to the remarks which had fallen from Alternate Commissioner Usinger and also to the subsequent discussion. As regards the former, he felt bound to say that the Resolution that had been submitted was based upon a serious misconception on a question of fact. It was a complete delusion to suppose that either at Lisbon or at any subsequent time the Commission had taken any decision which could be described as an "agreement in principle" procedure. For his part, he would have been strongly opposed to any such proposal, if it had ever been made. The Commission was a body charged with serious responsibilities and it would be quite wrong for it to adopt a procedure under which the members of the Commission divested themselves of part of their essential responsibilities by throwing them upon the shoulders of their Secretary. The actual proposal now submitted was therefore based upon a complete misunderstanding of the actual procedure of the Commission. He was however in general sympathy with the object sought in the Resolution if he was correct in interpreting what Alternate Commissioner Usinger had said as meaning that he and his associates desired to see the establishment of closer links during inter-Congress periods between the Secretary and the other members of the Commission. This was a matter however in which it was necessary to temper enthusiasm by a due regard to the hard facts of the situation. The Commission was not a body of whole-time salaried Commissioners, sitting continuously at a single centre, capable at any time of taking prompt decisions on matters submitted to them and possessing a whole-time salaried staff to carry out their decisions. If the Commission were such a body, many questions that were at present dealt with by the Secretary could usefully be referred to the Commission. As every zoologist knew, however, the actual structure of the Commission bore no resemblance to the ideal organisation outlined above. The members of the Commission were busy responsible zoologists holding (in most cases) important appointments in scientific institutions in many different parts of the world; they received no remuneration for the important services which they rendered as Commissioners; and the time which they devoted to their duties as members of the Commission was time which they voluntarily gave from what would otherwise be their leisure hours. Nor did the Commission possess a whole-time salaried staff to give effect to its decisions ; all that it possessed was a spare-time honorary Secretary. Clearly, therefore, there were limits to the amount of time which the members of the Commission could be expected to give to the discharge of their duties ; equally there was a limit to the amount of time which the Commissioner who held the Office of Secretary could be expected to devote to the duties of that Office. In these circumstances, it was necessary to put first things first : the prime essential was that whatever decision appeared in an *Opinion* or *Declaration* was a decision which had been expressly taken by the Commission as a whole either at one of its periodical meetings or by correspondence. Every *Opinion* or *Declaration* that had been published during his occupancy of the Office of Secretary had, of course, complied with this requirement. In this matter he had formed the view, when first elected to be Secretary, that the *Opinions* previously published were defective in form, in that they did not show clearly that the required procedure had been complied with. He had accordingly introduced a form of certificate of verification which he had appended to every *Opinion* published under his responsibility. In taking this action, he had been criticised as unduly formalistic by the very group of zoologists who now came forward as the advocates of stricter control over the Secretary. He had always considered that the objections raised to the addition to the *Opinions* of a certificate of verification were misconceived and the criticisms now advanced from the opposite angle confirmed him in that view. In considering the proposal brought forward by Alternate Commissioner Usinger, it was necessary to bear in mind that there was only a certain amount of time which the Secretary to the Commission could devote (at night and at week-ends) to the work of the Commission : this could be spent in either of two ways, (1) in consulting the members of the Commission in essential matters requiring their decision and for the rest in making such progress as was possible with the scientific work of the Commission ; (2) in consulting members of the Commission not only on matters requiring their decision but on other matters also, to the detriment of the scientific work which the Commission exists to perform. The first of these courses was, in his judgment, the right one ; the second, which appeared to be that advocated by Alternate Commissioner Usinger and his friends, the wrong one. If the Commission had shown any disposition to favour the second of these courses, he would have elaborated the grounds on which he considered that proposal mischievous and misconceived. It was evident however that this was not necessary, for the discussion which had taken place on Alternate Commissioner Usinger's proposal made it evident that it had won no support from the members of the Commission.

(Previous reference : Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 9)

Turning to the comments made by Alternate Commissioner Usinger regarding the "Editorial Notes" that he had attached to the reissues of the older *Opinions*, Secretary Hemming reminded the Commission that, when introducing the proposals for the incorporation in the *Règles* of the decisions embodied in the *Opinions*, he had pointed out that a minor incidental advantage of the course recommended was that it would eliminate the need for "Editorial Notes" of the kind to which Alternate Commissioner Usinger had referred, by depriving these *Opinions* of all except historical interest and importance. At the time when these "Editorial Notes" had been published, he had considered—and he remained of the same opinion—that it would have been indefensible to republish those *Opinions* without commentaries of the kind provided, for many of those *Opinions* had been rendered out of date and, in the absence of adequate explanations, positively misleading as the result of the failure of the Commission over a long period to keep their *Opinions* up-to-date in the light of subsequent events, such as the changes introduced into Article 25 by the Budapest Congress of 1927. Further, as the Commission now realised, there were cases where decisions taken by the Commission at one date were inconsistent with decisions already given. In these cases also (such as that presented by the generic name *Taenia* Linnaeus), it would have been quite wrong to republish the old *Opinions* without comment. It would, he agreed, have been better if these "Editorial Notes" could have been published under the express authority of the Commission, but that was not practicable at the time when the reissues in question appeared. In actual fact, no harm had been done, for, as the Commission was aware, they had during the present Session decided to incorporate in the *Règles* provisions which gave effect to the comments made in those "Notes" and, as regards those which dealt with individual cases of zoological nomenclature, to take action on the matters there raised.

Summing up his views on the subject raised by Alternate Commissioner Usinger, Secretary Hemming repeated that, so long as he remained Secretary to the Commission, every necessary step would be taken to ensure that, as in the past, decisions recorded in *Opinions* and *Declarations* conformed scrupulously in every respect with the decisions actually taken by the members of the Commission. As regards other matters, he must be allowed to retain his present discretion as regards what matters should be put to the Commission for decision and what matters could properly be decided on their behalf by himself as Secretary. He fully shared the view that it was desirable that everything possible should be done by himself to keep the other members of the Commission fully informed regarding the state of work of the Commission during inter-Congress periods; he paid tribute in this connection to the understanding and constructive spirit by which the suggestions made by Commissioner Chester Bradley were inspired. Taking up that suggestion, he (Secretary Hemming) would be prepared, if all those present did likewise, to vote in favour of a resolution which first took note of the existing procedure for securing the prior approval of members of the Commission on all matters relating to decisions recorded in *Opinions* and *Declarations*, and, second, invited the Secretary to the Commission to do everything which, having regard to the difficulties inevitably involved in operating the Secretariat of the Commission in the absence of an assured income and without qualified whole-time salaried officials, was, in his opinion, practicable to extend and formalise the existing procedure, (a) for seeking the advice of members of the Commission, (b) for consulting them on minor, as well as on major, matters, as these arose, and (c) for keeping them informed generally of the progress of the work of the Secretariat of the Commission. If Alternate Commissioner Usinger were to find a decision of this kind acceptable and were accordingly to ask leave to withdraw the proposal which he had himself placed before the Commission, he (Secretary Hemming), as Acting President, would then put this alternative proposal to the Commission as an alternative motion. If however Alternate Commissioner Usinger desired an express decision by the Commission on his own proposal, then he (the Acting President) would put his alternative proposal to the Commission as an amendment to the proposal submitted by Alternate Commissioner Usinger. If that amendment were to be adopted by the Commission, that adoption would carry with it automatically the rejection of Alternate Commissioner Usinger's proposal. If on the other hand the amendment were to be defeated, the next step would be for the Commission to take a straight vote on Alternate Commissioner Usinger's proposal.

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER ROBERT L. USINGER (U.S.A.) intimated that in the circumstances he did not wish to pursue the proposal under discussion to the extent of asking the Commission to take a vote upon it. He was prepared to accept the amendment which, on the suggestion of Commissioner Chester Bradley, the Acting President had just outlined.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT said that the statement just made by Alternate Commissioner Usinger cleared the air. It was, therefore, now possible formally to put to the Commission, as a substantive motion, the proposal embodying Commissioner Chester Bradley's suggestion which he had outlined a few minutes earlier. This he accordingly now did.

THE COMMISSION thereupon unanimously agreed :—

(1) to take note of the procedure already in force for ensuring that the wording of decisions recorded in the *Opinions* and *Declarations* published in their name was such as clearly to indicate the precise terms agreed upon by the Commission, when taking the decision in question ;

(2) to defer until the next item the decision to be taken in regard to the arrangements to be made to ensure that the draft of the Minutes of the Meetings held by the Commission during its Paris Session, when prepared by the Secretary after the close of the Congress, were concurred in by the Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners who had attended the Paris Congress, as constituting a full and accurate account of the decisions then taken ;

(3) to invite the Secretary to the Commission to do everything which, having regard to the difficulties inevitably involved in operating the Secretariat of the Commission in the absence of an assured income and without qualified whole-time salaried officials, was, in his opinion, practicable to extend and formalise the existing procedure, (a) for seeking the advice of members of the Commission, (b) for consulting members of the Commission on minor, as well as on major, matters, as these arose, and (c) for keeping them informed generally of the progress of the work of the Secretariat of the Commisssion.

Minutes of the Meetings of the Commission during its Paris Session: arrangements to be made for finalising the text of

65. As recorded in Conclusion 64 above, a discussion took place in the Commission regarding the nature of the procedure to be adopted to ensure that the draft of the Minutes of the Meetings of the Commission held during its Paris Session, when prepared by the Secretary to the Commission after the close of the Congress, were concurred in by the Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners who had attended the Paris Congress, as constituting a full and accurate account of the decisions then taken.

There was general agreement that adequate time should be provided to enable Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners who had attended the Paris Congress to study carefully the draft of the Minutes of the Meetings of the Commission held during that Session. This was particularly necessary in view of the large number and important character of the decisions taken. In the majority of cases full material in the form of the Papers of the I.C.(48) Series was already in the hands of Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners to enable them to satisfy themselves of the accuracy of the record prepared and it would only be necessary for them to make sure that any amendments agreed upon in discussion had been duly recorded. In some cases, however, the Commission had taken equally definite decisions but had agreed that, in view of the complexity of the drafting involved, it should be left to the Secretary to prepare, after the close of the Congress, a form of words which would give effect to the decision so taken. Special care would need to be taken in these cases to ensure that the wording, so prepared, did in fact give full effect to the decisions taken by the Commission.

There was general agreement also that, in view of the importance of avoiding any unnecessary delay in publishing the Minutes of the Paris Meetings of the Commission and thus making known to zoologists generally the important decisions which had been reached, the time to be granted to Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners for examining the draft Minutes should be no more than was required for that purpose.

It was recalled that in the Resolution on a kindred subject which had been moved by Alternate Commissioner Usinger in the discussion recorded in the preceding Conclusion (Conclusion 64), it had been suggested that in cases of urgency matters requiring the approval of Commissioners should be circulated in proof form and under a rigorous time limit and that discretion should be given to the Secretary to the Commission as to the manner in which any suggested amendment should be dealt with. In the course of the discussion the Secretary to the Commission intimated that he concurred in that proposal, in relation to the present matter, and invited Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners present to indicate what, in their view, that time limit should be. He added that he proposed to despatch the draft minutes by airmail and he accordingly suggested that it should be on this basis that the Commission should consider the question of the time limit to be fixed.

In reply to a question by the Acting President, ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER ROBERT L. USINGER (U.S.A). said that, as the drafts were to be despatched by airmail, and since none of the Commissioners or Alternate Commissioners who had attended the meeting lived in Australia or the Far East—the most distant from London being in California, a time limit of one month would, in his opinion, be adequate. General agreement was expressed with this view.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that this was an important matter and it was essential that there should be no room afterwards for misunderstanding in any quarter as to exactly what had been agreed upon. The draft minutes would be despatched to all Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners on the same day, those despatched to addresses outside the United Kingdom being despatched by airmail. The period within which comments were returnable would be one month from the date of posting and this would be made clear in a covering note despatched at the same time. The expression "one month" should be defined clearly, either as a four-week period or as a calendar month. At the conclusion of the time limit, immediate steps would be taken to deal with any amendments or corrections suggested, with a view to the publication of the Minutes in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature" at the earliest possible date. There must be a clear understanding, therefore, as to the action to be taken in the event of suggestions being received after the expiry of the time limit.

In response to a request for his views on these questions addressed to him by the Acting President, ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER USINGER (U.S.A.) said that it was a matter of indifference to him whether the expression "one month" for the present purpose was taken to mean a "4-week period" or "one calendar month." Perhaps the latter, as the easiest to calculate, was to be preferred. As regards the second point raised by the Acting President, he agreed that, after the expiry of the time limit, the Secretary should be free to press on with the publication of the Minutes as rapidly as possible. Subject to this, however, consideration should be given to any constructive suggestions that might be received after the appointed date.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the draft of the Minutes of the Meetings of the Commission held during its Paris (1948) Session, when prepared by the Secretary to the

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 26)

Commission, should be printed in readiness for publication in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature", as already decided upon by the Section on Nomenclature on receiving the recommendation on this subject submitted by the Commission ;

(2) that, as soon as proofs of the draft minutes, prepared in accordance with (1) above, were available, one copy should be despatched, for approval, to each Commissioner and Alternate Commissioner who had attended the Paris Congress, copies addressed to places situated outside the United Kingdom being despatched by airmail ;

(3) that a period of one calendar month, calculated from the date of mailing, should be allowed, within which the Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners concerned would be free to furnish to the Secretary to the Commission any suggestions for the amendment of the draft Minutes, when communicated to them under (2) above, such suggestions to be received not later than the last day of the period specified above and that a note reminding Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners of this decision should be included with the draft Minutes, when despatched to them in accordance with the procedure specified in (2) above ;

(4) that the Secretary to the Commission should be authorised to use his discretion either to accept, in whole or in part, or to reject, suggestions received by him under the procedure specified in (3) above ;

(5) that, immediately upon the expiry of the time limit specified in (3) above, the Secretary to the Commission should deal, in the manner specified in (4) above, with any suggestions received prior to that date from Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners, who had attended the Paris Session, and, having done so, should communicate the Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission held in Paris, so determined, to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, with a request that the Trust take immediate steps to arrange for the publication of the said Minutes in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature" ;

(6) that notwithstanding the provisions of (5) above, the Secretary should be free to consider and give effect to suggestions received after the date

specified in (3) above, provided that this did not entail any delay in the publication of the said Minutes.

Thanks of the Commission to those members of the Congress who had served as Alternate Members of the Commission during its Paris Session

66. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING), speaking in the name of the Permanent Members of the Commission, said that he felt sure that it would be the wish not only of those Commissioners who had attended the Paris Session of the Commission but also of those Members of the Commission who unhappily had been prevented, for one reason or another, from taking their places during the Paris Session to express both corporately and individually their thanks to the distinguished zoologists who had consented to assist the work of the Commission by serving as Alternate Members of the Commission during the present Congress. The Commission was greatly indebted to the Alternate Members of the Commission, many of whom had devoted long hours to the proceedings of the Commission, often at considerable personal inconvenience and always at the cost of not participating in the other activities of the Congress.

Without question put, THE PERMANENT MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION present thereupon agreed :—

(1) that the warm thanks of the Commission be accorded to those members of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology who had served as Alternate Members of the Commission during the present (Paris) Session for the valuable assistance which they had so rendered to the work of the Commission ;

(2) that the foregoing resolution be reported to the Section on Nomenclature, in order to give the Section an opportunity of associating itself with the expression of thanks to the Alternate Members of the Commission so recorded by the Permanent Commissioners ;

(3) to invite the Acting President, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission both to convey the thanks of the Commission to the Alternate Members of the Commission and also to report to the Section on Nomenclature the Resolution adopted by the Commission on this subject.

(*The Acting President thereupon conveyed to the Alternate Members of the Commission present the Resolution just adopted by the Permanent Members of the Commission and reported it also to the Section on Nomenclature.*)

(At this point Commissioner J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) rose in his place and said that he had a proposal which he desired to bring before the Commission regarding the services rendered by Commissioner Francis Hemming in the discharge of his duties both as Secretary to the Commission and as Acting President of the Commission during its Paris Session.)

(In accordance with Commissioner Chester Bradley's request, Secretary Hemming then vacated the Presidential Chair, which, on the invitation of the Commission was thereupon taken by Alternate Commissioner Harold Kirby (U.S.A.).)

Rising Vote of Thanks to Commissioner Francis Hemming for his services as Secretary to the Commission and as Acting President of the Commission during its Paris Session

67. COMMISSIONER J. CHESTER BRADLEY (U.S.A.) said that it would be the wish of the members of the Commission, including those who owing to other engagements had been unable to attend this evening's meeting, to place on record their gratitude to Commissioner Francis Hemming for the service which he had rendered to the Commission in the discharge of the onerous duties attaching to the Office of Secretary and their admiration of the manner in which he had discharged his duties as Acting President during the present Session, combining those duties as he had, with his heavy duties as Secretary to the Commission and also as President of the Section on Nomenclature. He was speaking for all members of the Commission in conveying to Mr. Hemming their grateful thanks for the immense amount of time and effort which both before and during the Paris Session he had given to secure that the work of the Commission at that Session should be as fruitful as possible. Mr. Hemming's work as the Secretary to the Commission was well known to every zoologist who was interested in questions of zoological nomenclature. Everybody who knew Mr. Hemming knew also his outstanding capacity for hard work and admired the energy and enthusiasm which he brought to his often difficult task. It would be the wish also of the Commission, in giving their thanks to Mr. Hemming, to join with his name that of his wife, who, as they knew, combined with her duties as a wife those of a highly skilled and indefatigable personal assistant.

Commissioner Chester Bradley therefore proposed that the Commission should record their appreciation of the services rendered by Mr. Hemming, both as Secretary to the Commission and as its Acting President during the present Session by giving him a Rising Vote of Thanks and that, in doing so, they should ask him to convey to Mrs.

Hemming their thanks also for the work which she had done to help to make the work of the Commission a success.

Thereupon, without question put, all the members of the Commission, together with the other members of the Section on Nomenclature present, rose in their places and gave Mr. Hemming a Rising Vote of Thanks for the services which he had rendered both as the Secretary to the Commission and, during the present Session, as Acting President, at the same time associating themselves with the tribute paid to him on their behalf by Commissioner Chester Bradley and asking him to convey their thanks also to Mrs. Hemming.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS HEMMING said that he desired to express his gratitude for the Rising Vote of Thanks which the Commission had just been good enough to give for his work as their Secretary and, during their present Session, as their Acting President, and, in particular to thank Commissioner Chester Bradley for the flattering terms in which he had made his proposal to the Commission. The duties of the President of the Commission were highly responsible at any meeting of the Commission, for it fell to him so to discharge his Office as to ensure a full opportunity to every member of the Commission, and, at public meetings of the Commission, to every member of the Congress, to express his views on questions brought before the Commission, while at the same time securing also that the whole programme of the Commission should be duly completed in the limited time available. At the present Congress these duties had been particularly onerous, both because of the long interval of thirteen years which had elapsed since the last Session of the Commission and because of the large number and important character of the problems awaiting the attention of the Commission. That the Commission had been successful in completing their consideration of all the questions brought before them was due mainly to the whole-hearted spirit in which they had addressed themselves to their task, to the co-operative spirit shown from the outset by all the Members of the Commission, and to the ready willingness which they had evinced to bring hard work, and to devote long hours, to the service of the Commission. All had been inspired to do everything in their power to contribute to the common goal and it was this spirit which had made it possible for the Commission to reach all its decisions by unanimity, and to achieve the large measure of definite progress in the development of zoological nomenclature, for which the present Session of the Commission and the present Congress would always be remembered.

Commissioner Hemming added that he had been much touched and greatly gratified at the reference which had been made to the great help rendered to him by his wife. He would gladly convey to her the message which had been entrusted to him by the Commission. He was very happy to have this opportunity himself to pay tribute to the constant help and encouragement given to him by his wife.

(At this point Alternate Commissioner Harold Kirby left the Presidential Chair which was resumed by Secretary Francis Hemming.)

Vote of Thanks to the Secretary-General of the Congress and to the Authorities of the Congress generally

68. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he felt sure that, before the Commission dispersed, they would wish to express their thanks to the Secretary-General of the Congress for the admirable arrangements which he had made for the meetings of the Commission during the present Congress. Never before probably and possibly never again would the Commission assemble in so distinguished a meeting place as the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard of the famous Sorbonne. The action of the Secretary-General in placing this room at the exclusive disposal of the Commission had been of the most inestimable value during the present Session, for that action alone had rendered it possible for the Commission to meet almost continuously during the past week. It had also been of the greatest convenience for all those members of the Section on Nomenclature who had wished to attend the public meetings of the Commission, for they had known from the outset where they would always find the Commission when in session. The Commission would wish also at the same time to record their gratitude to their French hosts for the arrangements made for their entertainment and for the hospitality extended to them during their visit to Paris. This had made the Congress not only of outstanding importance in the scientific field but also the occasion for the happiest memories for all who had attended it.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to express their thanks to Professor E. Fischer-Piette, Secretary-General to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology for the admirable arrangements made by him for the meetings of the Commission during its Paris Session ;

(2) to record their gratitude to their French hosts for the arrangements made for their entertainment and for the hospitality extended to them during their visit to Paris.

Close of the Proceedings of the Commission at its Paris Session

69. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the Commission had now completed the whole of its business and it only remained for him once more to thank the Commission for the kindness which they had shown to him in the discharge of his duties as their Acting President.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT then pronounced the Paris Session of the Commission to be closed.

(*The Paris Session of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature thereupon terminated at* 0045 *hours on Tuesday,* 27*th July* 1948.)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 21st–27th July, 1948

NOTE OF A DECISION taken at an Informal (Fifteenth) Meeting held at the Hotel Lutetia, Paris, at the concluson of the Final Banquet of the Congress on Tuesday, 27th July, 1948 at 2215 hours.

The following took part in the consultation recorded below:

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
Professor E. Beltrán (Mexico)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Dr. E. Hindle (United Kingdom)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Professor Z. P. Metcalf (U.S.A.)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor R. Spärck (Denmark)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following other Member of the Section on Nomenclature was also consulted:

Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)

The following was also present:

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary.*

Communiqué on the work of the Commission during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology to be issued to the

1. MR. FRANCIS HEMMING (ACTING PRESIDENT) and Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming (*Personal Assistant to the Secretary to the Commission*) handed to each of the Commissioners and other zoologists named above a copy of the draft of a communiqué prepared during the day by

scientific press of the world : approval of terms of

Secretary Hemming for issue to the scientific press of the world setting out the principal decisions in regard to the development of zoological nomenclature taken by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology on the unanimous advice of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and of the Section on Nomenclature of the Congress. Several requests for such a Communiqué had already been received by the Secretary to the Commission. Secretary Hemming had every sympathy with these requests and considered that they should be granted. He was of the opinion, however, that the terms of the Communiqué so to be issued should be approved by the Commission and not issued under his personal authority only. He had accordingly prepared during the course of the afternoon the draft now distributed to the Members of the Commission attending the Final Banquet of the Congress and also to Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.). Each of the Commissioners and other zoologists so consulted was asked to study the draft Communiqué carefully and to inform the Secretary to the Commission whether he agreed that it contained an accurate account of the principal decisions in regard to zoological nomenclature taken during the Congress and, if so, whether he concurred in the issue to the scientific press of the world of a Communiqué in the terms proposed.

Each of the Commissioners and other zoologists consulted agreed that the Communiqué was a correct record of the action taken by the Commission and the Congress and associated himself in taking responsibility for the issue of the Communiqué in the name of the Commission and the Congress. One or two Commissioners drew attention to typing errors in the copies circulated or offered suggestions for minor drafting changes. The Secretary to the Commission undertook to take account of these suggestions.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) approved, subject to certain minor drafting suggestions, the terms of the draft Communiqué respecting the principal decisions in regard to the development of zoological nomenclature taken by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology on the unanimous advice of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and of the Section on Nomenclature, prepared by the Secretary to the Commission for issue to the scientific press of the world in the name of, and by the authority of, the Commission ;

(2) authorised and requested the Secretary to the Commission forthwith to issue in their name a Communiqué to the scientific press of the world in the terms of the draft approved in (1) above.

The Secretary to the Commission accordingly undertook to issue to the scientific press of the world the Communiqué just approved by the Commission, immediately upon his return to London, as soon as arrangements could be made for the preparation of the necessary number of copies.

PURCHASED
26 JUN 1960

BRITISH MUSEUM NATURAL HISTORY

THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, have great pleasure in expressing their grateful thanks to the UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION (U.N.E.S.C.O.) for the financial assistance afforded towards the cost of producing the present volume.

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Notice to subscribers regarding the arrangements made for the completion of volume 1 and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5

The following arrangements have been made for completing volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5 :—

Volume 1 : A concluding Part (Part 12), containing, *inter alia*, the Title Page, Table of Contents, and alphabetical subject index, will be published shortly.

Volume 2 : This volume, like Volume 1, will be devoted to the publication of applications in regard to nomenclatorial problems submitted by specialists to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. Publication will commence at an early date.

Volume 3 : This volume, which is now complete in 9 Parts, is devoted to the publication of the memoranda, reports and other documents considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at their meetings held in Paris in July 1948.

Volume 4 : This volume is devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July* 1948. Twenty-one Parts have been published and this volume is now complete except for the index which will be published in a concluding Part.

Volume 5 : At the request of the Bureau of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, this volume will be devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July* 1948, together with the Reports submitted to the Congress by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature.

INQUIRIES

All inquiries regarding publications should be addressed to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, and all inquiries regarding the scientific work of the Commission to the Secretary to the Commission at the following addresses :—

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7, England.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : Secretariat of the Commission, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.

Printed in Great Britain by Metchim and Son, Ltd., Westminster London

VOLUME 4. Parts 22/24
pp. 653–760.

29th November, 1950

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

URCHASED
24 [illegible]

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

CONTENTS :

The Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July 1948 :

Page

Certification of the text of the Official Record of Proceedings : Supplementary Note by the Secretary to the Commission 653

Corrigenda 654

Index 655–760

Particulars of dates of publication of the several Parts in which the present volume was published 760

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948,

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature at the Publications Office of the Trust
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1950

Price One pound, twelve shillings.

(*All rights reserved*)

CERTIFICATION OF THE TEXT OF THE OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE AT ITS SESSION OF MEETINGS HELD IN PARIS IN JULY 1948

Supplementary Note by the Secretary to the Commission

In the introductory portion to the present volume (pp. xiii–xv) I recalled the arrangements for securing an agreed text of the Official Record of the Proceedings of the Commission during its Paris Session of Meetings, made by the Commission in Paris in July 1948 and approved by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, and set out the steps which subsequently I had taken in compliance with the foregoing decisions. I explained (p. xiv) that of the fifteen (15) Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners who had been present at the Paris Session fourteen (14) had signified their concurrence in, and approval of, the text as published in the present volume. I added that, in spite of repeated efforts I had been unable to obtain a reply from the fifteenth member concerned, Alternate Commissioner E. Beltrán (Mexico), who, I assumed, must be either ill or away from his home.

In supplement to the information summarised above, I have now to report that today (13th June 1950) I received by airmail a letter, dated 9th June 1950, in which, after explaining that, until a few weeks ago, he had been away from Mexico City and inaccessible for mail, Alternate Commissioner Beltrán stated that he had now examined the draft of the Official Record of Proceedings of the Commission in Paris and found himself in full agreement with the text submitted.

With the receipt of Alternate Commissioner Beltrán's letter, replies have now been received from all the fifteen (15) Members and Alternate Members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature who attended the Meetings of the Commission held in Paris in July 1948 during the sittings of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology. The Official Record of Proceedings of the Commission at its Paris Session, as published in the present volume, have accordingly now been approved by all the Members and Alternate Members of the Commission who attended that Session.

FRANCIS HEMMING
Secretary to the International Commission
on Zoological Nomenclature

Secretariat of the Commission :
28 Park Villiage East,
Regent's Park, London, N.W.1.
England.
13*th June*, 1950.

CORRIGENDA

page 15. Fifth line from foot of page : substitute " 1938–1939 " for " 1939 ".

page 20. Line 18 : substitute " 19 " for " 21 ".

page 69. Fifth line from foot of page :

  (1) At beginning of line, insert heading " (b) ".

  (2) Before word " insertion " insert word " the ".

page 146. First side heading, line 3 : substitute " 190 and 191 " for " and 190 ".
 line 13 : substitute " *Opinions* 190 and " for " *Opinion* ".

page 205. Fifteenth line from foot of page : substitute " prénom " for " prenom ".

page 486. Line 2 : substitute " 1871 " for " [1871] ".

INDEX

Page

abietum Bergroth, 1914, *Gastrodes*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Gastrodes* Westwood, 1840; placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 473

Abrocoma Waterhouse, 1837, *see Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829.

Acarus alatus Hermann, 1804, an invalid homonym of *Acarus alatus* Schrank, 1803, although the latter a *nomen dubium* 398

aceris Esper [1783] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio aceris*) placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 458

Acme Hartmann, 1821, an available name and under no necessity to be amended to *Acmea* 391

Acmea Hartmann, 1821, an available name and not an emendation of *Acme* Hartmann, 1821 391

Acmea Hartmann, 1821, and *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1830, declared not to be homonyms of one another but so close as to cause confusion in group concerned; specialists to be consulted by Secretary on question whether, in order to avoid confusion, *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, should be suppressed under the plenary powers thereby rendering *Truncatella* Risso, 1826, available for that genus, and at the same time retaining *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1830, in its accustomed sense 391

Actinote Hübner [1819], *Papilio thalia* Linnaeus, 1758, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of; placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" .. 394

aegyptiellus, a trivial name published conditionally by Strand in 1909 for an Egyptian subspecies of *Halictus morbillosus* Kirchbaumer, 1873, to be attributed to Strand and to take priority as from 1909, the year in which it was published by that author 256

Aestivo-autumnal Malaria Parasite, *see* Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite.

Agriades Hübner, [1819], placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" (type species designated under the plenary powers: *Papilio glandon* Prunner, 1798) 484

agrorum Fabricius, 1787 (as published in the binominal combination *Apis agrorum*), application for the use of the plenary powers to determine the use of, deferred for further information to be obtained 417

alatus Hartmann, 1804 (as published in the binominal combination *Acarus alatus*) a junior homonym of *alatus* Schrank, 1803 (as published in the binominal combination *Acarus alatus*) and, as such, to be rejected, it being irrelevant for the purposes of the *Règles* that the name *Acarus alatus* Schrank is (or is regarded by some specialists as) a *nomen dubium* 398

Alca Linnaeus, 1758, placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" type species, by absolute tautonymy: *Alca torda* Linnaeus, 1758) 581

alceae Esper, [1780], (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio alceae*) placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 485

Page

Alydus Fabricius, 1803, validated under the plenary powers; placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" (type species selected by Curtis, 1831: *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus, 1758) 467

Amaral, Commissioner Afranio do, absence of, from Paris Session 3

election of, in 1937, as a Commissioner *vice* Commissioner Anton Handlirsch (resigned) .. 15

appointment of, to Class 1953 on expiry of term of service of Class 1943 13

nomination of, to be Vice-President in succession to Vice-President James L. Peters, nominated to be President 23–24

amendment of *Règles*, introduction of an Article governing procedure in relation to, *see Règles*, etc., New Article (21).

Ammonia Brünnich, 1771, Secretary to submit Report on 313

Amplypterus Hübner, [1819], *Sphinx panopus* Cramer, [1779] declared to be the type species of, by selection by Kirby, 1892; placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 509

ampulla Linnaeus, 1758, *Bulla*, designated under plenary powers to be the type species of *Bulla* Linnaeus, 1758; placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 305

annulatum, commonly treated as having been published by Dschunkowsky & Luhs in the binominal combination *Piroplasma annulatum*, provisionally to be treated as having been published in 1905 432

Sergent in error in rejecting, on ground that, when first published, it was the name of a composite species 432–433

species to which applies, determined by Witenberg (1947) under Article 31 433

anonymously published names (including names published over pseudonyms or initials only), definition of status of 213–215

antillarum Kirkaldy, 1909, *Cimex*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Tetyra* Fabricius, 1803; placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names Zoology" 474

Apatura Fabricius, 1807, validated under the plenary powers 456

placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" (type species selected by Curtis, 1831: *Papilio iris* Linnaeus, 1758) 457

Apatura [Illiger], 1807, suppressed under the plenary powers; placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" 456

Aplysia, the valid emended form of *Laplysia* Linnaeus, 1767 302

Aplysia Linnaeus, 1767, *Aplysia depilans* Gmelin, 1791, designated, under the plenary powers, to be the type species of 301–304

placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 303

Page

Aplysiella Fischer, 1872, Secretary to confer with specialists for the purpose of ascertaining whether confusion would result if this name were to be replaced by *Petalifera* Gray, 1847 389

Appendice to *Règles* to be converted into a Schedule *see Règles*, etc, *Appendice*.

Apstein, Commissioner Karl, resignation of, reported 15

Aquarius Schellenberg, 1800, *Cimex najas* De Geer, 1773, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of; placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 473

aquatica Linnaeus, 1758, *Podura*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Podura* Linnaeus, 1758 506

placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 507

Arachnoides Klein, 1778, rejected for nomenclatorial purposes, as based on mere republication, without reinforcement, of *Arachnoides* Klein, 1734 533

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" 535

Arachnoides Leske, 1778, validated under the plenary powers and *Echinus placenta* Linnaeus, 1758, similarly designated as type species; placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 534

Archaeocidaris M'Coy, 1844 (type species, by monotypy: *Cidaris urii* Fleming, 1828) application for validation of, under the plenary powers, deferred for further information to be obtained 516

arenarius, as published by Edwards, 1771, in the binominal combination *Cancer arenarius* not available because a junior homonym of *Cancer arenarius* Toreen, 1765; placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 578

argus Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio argus*), application of, determined under the plenary powers; placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 480

argyrognomon Bergstrasser [1779] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio argyrognomon*), application of, determined under the plenary powers 479

placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 480

aristolochiae Fabricius, 1775 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio aristolochiae*) validated under the plenary powers: placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 545

aristolochiae Pallas (as published prior to 1780 in the binominal combination *Papilio aristolochiae*) suppressed under the plenary powers 544

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 545

Arndt, Commissioner Walther, election of, in 1937, as a Commissioner *vice* Commissioner Karl Apstein (resigned) 15

Page

Arndt, Commissioner Walther, etc.—*continued.*

election of, to Class 1946 on expiry of term of service of Class 1937 10

murder of, by Gestapo in 1944, reported; adoption by Commission of Resolution emphatically condemning the disgraceful crime which led to the death of Commissioner Arndt at the hands of the Gestapo 9

arvensis Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Vespa arvensis*), application for the use of the plenary powers to determine the use of, deferred for further information to be obtained 417

ascanius Cramer, [1775] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio ascanius*) validated under the plenary powers; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 545

ascanius Linnaeus, 1768 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio ascanius*) suppressed under the plenary powers 544

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 545

Aspidoproctus declared available as from Newstead [April] 1901 (type species by monotypy: *Walkeriana pertinax* Newstead, 1901) and placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 381

atropos Lamarck, 1816, *Spatangus*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Moira* Agassiz (A.), 1872 527

placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 528

Aturoidea published by Vredenberg in 1925, declared to be of sub-generic status as from 1925 and accordingly to have priority over *Paraturia* Spath, 1927 443

Aubert, M. J., attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission 272

Aulocera Butler, 1867 (type species designated by Butler, 1867: *Satyrus brahminus* Blanchard, 1844) placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 494

australis Walker, 1856 (as published in the binominal combination *Oxycanus australis*); placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 357

austriacus Schrank, 1776, *Cimex*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Bellocoris* Hahn, 1834; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 473–474

" available name," expression defined (*see also* " valid name ") 336

Belloc, M., attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission 6, 306, 354

Page

Bellocoris Hahn, 1834, *Cimex austriacus* Schrank, 1776, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of; placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 474

Belone Cuvier, 1817, validated under the plenary powers; placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" (type species by absolute tautonomy: *Esox belone* Linnaeus, 1761) 428

belone Linnaeus, 1761 (as published in the binominal combination *Esox belone*) placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 428

Belone Oken, 1815, suppressed under the plenary powers; placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" 428

Beltrán, Professor Enrique, appointment of, to be an Alternate Commissioner *vice* Commissioner Angel Cabrera 62

attendance by, at meetings of the Commission 6, 62, 190, 230, 425, 649

approval by, of Minutes of Paris Meetings 653

Benign Tertian Malaria Parasite, determination of scientific name of 618

bennetti Waterhouse, 1837, *Abrocoma*, see *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829.

Beosus Amyot & Serville, 1843, *Cimex maritimus* Scopoli, 1763, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of; placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 474

Berthet, M. H., attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission 230

bibliographical reference for each name discussed, recommended to be inserted in any given paper 170

bicolor Douglas & Scott, 1868, *Litosoma*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Pachylops* Fieber, 1858; placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 474

Bilharzia Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856, suppression of, under the plenary powers .. 319–323

"binary nomenclature", expression deleted from *Règles* and expression "binominal nomenclature" substituted therefor, *see Règles*, Article 25, Proviso (b).

Report on, approved by the Commission and submitted to the Congress 64–65

"binominal nomenclature", substitution of expression for "binary nomenclature" in *Règles*, *see Règles*, Article 25, Proviso (b)

bisperforatus Leske, 1778 (as published in the binominal combination *Echinodiscus bisperforatus*); placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 535

Bolivar y Pieltain, Commissioner Candido, resignation of, reported 15

Page

Bombus Latreille, 1802, validated under the plenary powers so far as necessary, with *Apis terrestris* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species (by monotypy) 406–407

placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 407

Bonnet, Professor Pierre, attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission .. 6, 62, 272

proposals submitted by, arrangements for consideration of 209–212

Boschma, Commissioner H., in attendance at Paris Session 2

election of, in post-war period, as a Commissioner *vice* Commissioner Walther Arndt (deceased) 16

appointed to Class 1955 on expiry of term of service of Class 1946 13

attendance by, at Meetings of the Commission .. 1, 6, 37, 62, 83, 107, 190, 230, 280, 306, 354, 649

approval by, of Minutes of Paris Meetings xiv

Bradley, Commissioner J. Chester, in attendance at Paris Session 2

election of, in war period, as a Commissioner *vice* Commissioner Witmer Stone (deceased) 16

attendance by, at Meetings of the Commission .. 1, 6, 37, 62, 83, 107, 190, 230, 239, 280, 306, 354, 425, 649

approval by, of Minutes of Paris Meetings xiv

Bradycellus Erichson, 1837, application for the designation under the plenary powers of *Carabus collaris* Paykull, 1798, as type species of, deferred for further information to be obtained 443, 444

brahminus Blanchard, 1844 (as published in the binominal combination *Satyrus brahminus*) placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 496

brassicae Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio brassicae*); placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 496

Brassolis, Fabricius, 1807, validated under the plenary powers 456

placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " (type species selected by Blanchard, 1840 : *Papilio sophorae* Linnaeus, 1758) 457

Brassolis [Illiger], 1807, suppressed under the plenary powers; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 456

Bremus Panzer-Jurine, [1801–1804], suppressed under plenary powers, so far as necessary to validate *Bombus* Latreille, 1802; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 406–407

Brisson (M.J.), 1760, *Ornithologia sive Synopsis methodica sistens Avium Divisiones in Ordines,* names in, validated under the plenary powers 65

title of above work to be entered in Schedule established for recording decisions taken under the plenary powers 65–66

Page

Brisson, 1762, *Regnum animale* (ed. 2), status of, to be considered as soon as possible after publication of Report thereon by the Secretary 313–314

Brissus Dahl, 1823 (emend. of *Bryssus* Dejean, 1821) suppressed under the plenary powers 526

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 528

Brissus Gray, 1825, validated under the plenary powers and *Spatangus brissus* var. *unicolor* Leske, 1778, similarly designated as type species 526

placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 527

Brissus Leske, 1778, declared non-existant under the *Règles*, because not published in the nominative singular 527

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 528

Brissus Link, 1807, suppressed under the plenary powers 526

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 528

Brissus Modeer, 1793, suppressed under the plenary powers 526

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 528

Brissus Müller (O.F.), 1781, suppressed under the plenary powers 525

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 528

Brissus Oken, 1815, suppressed under the plenary powers 526

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 528

Brissus, as used by any other author prior to the publication of *Brissus* Gray, 1825, suppressed under the plenary powers 526

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 528

Brünnich, 1771, *Zoologiae Fundamenta*, a nomenclatorially available work .. 307–310

date " 1772 " commonly attributed to, incorrect, actual date of publication being 1771 .. 307

Bryozoa and Polyzoa, question of relative status of, deferred pending Report by Secretary on general question of Class Names 386

Bryssus Dejean, 1821, suppressed under the plenary powers.. 526

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 528

Bulla Linnaeus, 1758, *Bulla ampulla* Linnaeus, 1758, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 305

Page

" Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclatur ," Vol. 1, contents of Parts of, to be examined in turn
  Part 5 364
  Part 8 372
  Part 9 400
  Part 10 425
  Part 11 448

" Buprestidae " (an anonymous pamphlet issued by Hope (F.W.) in 1836), new names contained in, declared unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes 371

By-Laws of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, *see* Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature, Section (b)

Cabot, D. A. E., thanked by the Commission for assistance given in searching the literature to determine the first publication of the name *Piroplasma annulatum* commonly attributed to Dschunkowsky & Luhs 433

Cabrera, Commissioner Angel, absence of, from Paris Session 3

  appointment of, to Class 1949 on expiry of term of service of Class 1940 13

  nomination of, to Class 1958 on expiry of term of service of Class 1949 19

  nomination of, to be a Member of the Commission for a further term on abolition of the system of 9-year Classes in the membership of the Commission and consequent reversal of decision to establish a Class 1958 46

calcaratus Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Cimex calcaratus*); placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 467

Calliphora Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (type species by original designation: *Musca vomitoria* Linnaeus, 1758); placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 355–356

Calman, Commissioner W.T., absence of, from Paris Session 3

  election of, to Class 1946 on completion of term of service of Class 1937 10

  nomination of, to Class 1955 on the expiry of the term of service of the Class 1946 .. 13

Camelus Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered 582

Camponotus Mayr, 1861 (type species, by selection by Bingham, 1903: *Formica ligniperda* Latreille, 1802); placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " .. 409–410

canaliferus Lamarck, 1816 (as published in the binominal combination *Spatangus canaliferus*); placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " .. 528

Page

Caporiacco, Commissioner Lodovico, in attendance at Paris Session 2

election of, in 1939 as Commissioner *vice* Commissioner F. Silvestri (resigned) ; 15

appointment of, to Class 1952 on expiry of term of service of Class 1943 13

attendance by, at Meetings of the Commission .. 1, 6, 37, 62, 83, 107, 190, 230, 239, 272, 280, 306, 354, 425, 649

approval by, of Minutes of Paris Meetings xiv

Caprimulgus Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered 582

Carabus Linnaeus, 1758, *Carabus granulatus* Linnaeus, 1758, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of ; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 446

Carcharodus Hübner, [1819], placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " (type species designated under the plenary powers : *Papilio alceae* Esper [1780]) .. 484

caricae Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio caricae*) ; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 458

Castnia Fabricius, 1807, validated under the plenary powers 456

placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " (type species selected by Latreille, 1810 : *Papilio icarus* Cramer [1775]) 457

oldest available name for type species of, when determined, to be placed on " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 459

Castnia [Illiger], 1807, suppressed under the plenary powers ; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 456

Catesby (Mark), *The Natural History of Carolina*, George Edwards edition of 1771, suppression of, under *Opinion* 89 not to apply to names in concordance based on Linnean system 571

Catoplatus Spinola, 1837, *Tingis fabricii* Stål, 1868, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of ; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " .. 474

-cauda and *-caudatus, -a, -um*, see *-costa, -costatus, -a, -um* .. ..

centuncularis Linnaeus, 1758, *Apis*, declared the type species of *Megachile* Latreille, 1802 ; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 413

Ceratina Latreille, [1802–1803] application for validation of, under the plenary powers, deferred for further information to be obtained 407

Ceratodon, generic name, first published in Brünnich, 1771, *Zoologiae Fundamenta*, if Brisson, 1762, *Regnum animale* (ed. 2), found to be not available 314

Cercopithecus validated under the plenary powers as a generic name as from Linnaeus, 1758, and position on " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " confirmed 310–311

Page

Cercopithecus Brünnich, 1771, declared a homonym of *Cercopithecus* Linnaeus, 1758 (validated under the plenary powers); placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 311

cereus Linnaeus, 1767 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio cereus*); placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 458

Certhia Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered 582

Chaos Linnaeus, 1767, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered 583

Chapin, Dr. E. A., attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission .. 83, 107, 190, 230, 239, 272, 280, 306, 354, 425, 649

Chapman, Commissioner Frederick, appointment of, to Class 1949 on expiry of term of service of Class 1940 13

death of, reported; adoption by Commission of Resolution of regret at death of 9

Charadrius Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered.. 582

Chavan, M. André, attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission .. 6, 62, 230, 272, 280

Chinchilla Bennett, 1829, application regarding type species of, deferred for further information to be obtained 440

Chinchilla Rat (*Abrocoma bennetti* Waterhouse, 1837), *see Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829

Chrysopa Leach, 1815, *Hemerobius perla* Linnaeus, 1758, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 396

ciliaris Philippi, 1837 (as published in the binominal combination *Asterias ciliaris*) (oldest available name for the type species (*Luidia fragilissima* Forbes, 1839) of *Luidia* Forbes, 1839, placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " in *Opinion* 129) placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 513

Classes, rules governing nomenclature of, question of introducing into the *Règles*, to be examined by the Secretary 385–386

claratus Linnaeus, 1767, *Cimex*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Pilophorus* Hahn, 1826; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 474

Clavellaria Lamarck, 1801, suppressed under the plenary powers for purposes of Article 25; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 404

Clavellarius Olivier, 1789, suppressed under the plenary powers for purposes of Article 25: placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 404

Page

Clavicera Latreille [1802], *see* *Ceratina* Latreille [1802–1803].

Clerck, 1757, *Aranei svecici*, names in, validated as from 1758 and with priority over Linnaeus, 1758 by a proviso added to Article 26 274–277, 315–319

Code, International, of Zoological Nomenclature, *see Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique.*

coeruleus Müller (O.F.), 1785 (as published in the binomonal combination *Cyclops coeruleus*) suppressed under the plenary powers for purposes of Article 25 but not for those of Article 35 376

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 377

Colymbus Linnaeus, 1758, type species of; previous delay in dealing with application regarding condemned; Secretary to prepare Report on as soon as possible 362

Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature: composition, personnel, procedure, etc.

(a) *Arrangements for Meetings of, during Paris Session*

Alternate Members of the Commission, appointed of, for duration of Paris Session 3–4

meeting place during Paris Session 36

meetings to be held in public 4

meetings to be held jointly with Section on Nomenclature, as far as practicable 4–5

Official Languages to be English and French 6

procedure to be adopted with the object of expediting conduct of business 7–8

programme for Paris Session 27–28

Secretary to officiate as Acting President in the absence of the President and Vice-President 1

submission of Reports to Section on Nomenclature, arrangements for 32–35

Minutes of Meetings, arrangements for securing agreed text of 640–644

communiqué issued to Press at close of Session 649–651

(b) *By-Laws of*

suspension of, for duration of Paris Session 8

revision of, on comprehensive basis, to include references to all duties and powers conferred by the International Congress of Zoology 59–60

division of, when revised, into two parts: (1) Organic Articles embodying decisions taken by the Congress and therefore not subject to change by the Commission, (2) other Articles (recommendation to Congress) 327

Secretary invited to submit to members of Commission as soon as practicable after the close of the Congress a revised draft of the By-Laws giving effect to decisions taken by the International Commission during its Paris Session 60–61

Page

(b) **By-Laws of—*continued*.**

Article regarding, to be inserted in the *Règles* (recommendation to Congress) 327

By-Laws, as revised, to be printed and copies to be available at all times for sale ..61, 328

(c) *composition of, proposed reform of (recommendations to Congress)* : discussion regarding 35, 37–50

Proposals submitted to the Congress regarding :

removal of upper limit hitherto imposed on the membership of the Commission, the present upper of limit of eighteen to be reained as a minimum ; institution of a system providing for the direct representation on the Commission of zoologists in any country in which any considerable amount of zoological work is being conducted 39

provision for establishment of an appropriate balance in the membership of the Commission both geographically and as between different types of knowledge, experience and interest 39–40

retention by Commission of right to elect to its membership specialists of outstanding eminence, irrespective of the representative principle 40, 43

method to be followed in obtaining nominations for representative seats on the Commission 40–43

method to be followed in scrutinising the qualifications of candidates nominated for election as Commissioners ; method to be followed in electing Commissioners ; method to be followed in filling casual vacancies in the membership of the Commission 42–44

elections of Commissioners to be announced in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature" 44

revised procedure for Commissioners to submit themselves periodically to re-election ; abolition of the system by which the membership of the Commission divided into three 9-year Classes ; institution of a revised system for determining the order of precedence of Commissioners at any given time 45

grant of leave of absence to Commissioners in certain circumstances and arrangements to be made for their temporary replacement by Alternate Commissioners 46–49

removal of Commissioners for certain specified causes 14, 49

(d) *Emergency created by the outbreak of war in* 1939

assumption by the President, on outbreak of war in 1939, of extraordinary powers for the duration of the emergency, to preserve the existence of the Commission and issue of the "Emergency Powers, Declaration, 1939" 10–13

issue by the President of Directions under the Emergency Powers Declaration constituting Classes 1949 and 1952 to replace the Classes 1940 and 1943, when time expired 13

issue by the President of Directions under the Emergency Powers Declaration confirming in their Offices those members of the Commission whose term of service as Officers had expired consequent upon the completion of the term of service of the Classes of which they were severally members 16–17

adoption of a resolution approving the action taken by the President at the outbreak of war in 1939 for the purpose of safeguarding the existence of the Commission (recommendation to Congress) 12–13

(e) *Financial and administrative problems in period* 1936–1948

Report by Secretary on 28–31

Page

(f) *Membership of Commission*

losses through death since 1935, report on .. 8

murder of Commissioner W. Arndt (Germany) by Gestapo during the war, adoption of resolution emphatically condemning .. 9

losses through resignation, etc., since 1935, report on .. 15

election of Commissioners since 1935 .. 15–16

proposed institution of a rule under which in certain circumstances a Commissioner who loses contact with the Commission shall be treated as having vacated his membership (recommendation to Congress) .. 14

German representation on Commission, German zoologists to be given a fresh opportunity of expressing their wishes regarding .. 18–19

Japanese representation on the Commission, Japanese zoologists to be given a fresh opportunity of expressing their wishes regarding .. 18–19

Class 1946 established *vice* Class 1937, on expiry of term of service of Class 1937 .. 10

Classes 1949 and 1952 established during the war by the President under the Emergency Powers Declaration, 1939, on the expiry of the term of service of the Classes 1940 and 1943 respectively .. 13

Class 1955 established in 1947 on expiry of term of service of Class 1946 .. 13

Class 1958, proposals for establishment of, *vice* Class 1949, as from close of Paris Congress .. 17–18, 19

abolition of system by which membership of Commission divided into three 9-year Classes and institution of a revised system for determining the relative precedence of Commissioners and the order in which submission for re-election required (recommendation to Congress) .. 45

consequential withdrawal of recommendation for establishment of a Class 1958, and substitution of revised proposals for renewing part of the membership of the Commission at the close of the Paris Congress .. 45–46

(g) *Offices of the Commission*

Assistant Secretary, Office of

creation of, in 1939 .. 9

election of Commissioner James L. Peters to, in 1939 .. 10

proposed abolition of, in its present form, and reconstitution of, as an Office in the Secretariat of the Commission .. 24–25

Honorary Life President

proposed creation of Office of, as an *ad hoc* arrangement, the post to be offered to Commissioner Karl Jordan as a mark of affection and respect on his retirement from the Office of President of the Commission (recommendation to Congress) .. 22

President, Office of

resignation of, by Commissioner Karl Jordan on grounds of infirmity; President Jordan's resignation accepted with the greatest regret .. 21

President, Office of—*continued.*

Page

Vice-President James L. Peters nominated to be President (recommendation to Congress) 22

Secretary, Office of

Commissioner Francis Hemming elected to, in 1936 9

nomination of Commissioner Francis Hemming for a further term of service on the close of the Paris Congress (recommendation to Congress) 23

Vice-President, Office of

creation of, in 1939 ; election of Commissioner C. W. Stiles to, in 1939 9

election of Assistant Secretary James L. Peters to, in 1945 (in succession to the late Commissioner C. W. Stiles) 17

nomination of Commissioner A. de Amaral to (recommendation to Congress) 24

Offices, all holders of, confirmed in their position by the President under the Emergency Powers Declaration, 1939, on the expiry of the period of service of the Officers concerned during the war period, consequent upon the completion of the term of service of the Classes of which the Officers concerned were severally members .. 16, 17

(h) *Official Record of Proceedings of the Commission at its Paris Session* .. .. ..

draft (giving full and detailed account) to be prepared by Secretary as soon as possible after close of Paris Session 342

draft to be printed and proofs to be submitted for comment and approval to Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners attending the Paris Session 642–643

text to be settled by Secretary in the light of comments received from Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners 643

text to be published in " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature " as soon as possible after having been finally settled 342, 643

memoranda considered by the Commission during Paris Session to be published in " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature " 342

(i) *Procedure, proposed reform of* (*recommendations to Congress*)

voting procedure in cases not involving either a suggested change in the *Règles* or the use by the Commission of its plenary powers 50–51

voting procedure in cases involving a suggested change in the *Règles* 51

voting procedure in cases involving the use by the Commission of its plenary powers (*see* also " *Règles*, etc., New Article (12) ") 55–56

serial publications in which proposed that advertisements of plenary powers cases should be published 56

revised procedural arrangements to come into force forthwith 57

revised time-table for dealing with applications, and matters incidental thereto .. 58—59

issue to zoologists of announcement regarding revised time-table to be aimed at by the Commission, when dealing with applications on questions of nomenclature 59

Page

(j) *Report to Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology*

draft Report examined in detail jointly with Section on Nomenclature 283–287

draft Report amended in certain respects 285–286

Report, as amended, unanimously adopted by Commission and submitted to Section on Nomenclature 287–288

supplementary points on the Commission's Report, submission of, to Section on Nomenclature 423–424, 559–560, 564, 566, 591, 625, 628–630, 630–631

(k) *Secretariat of the Commission*

Report by Secretary on work during period 1936–1948 28–31

Secretary's Report to be submitted to the Congress 31

Procedure during inter-Congress periods, arrangements for improving liaison between the Secretariat and members of the Commission 632–640

(l) *Co-operation with specialist groups*

Report by Secretary on developments since 1935 25–27

(m) *Votes of thanks adopted by the Commission to*

Alternate Commissioners for services rendered as such during the Paris Session .. 644

Elliot, Colonel the Right Hon. Walter, for accepting the Chairmanship of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature 31

Hemming, Francis, for services as Secretary to the Commission and as Acting President during the Paris Session 645–647

Hemming, Mrs. M. F. W., *Personal Assistant to the Secretary to the Commission*, for share in preparing proposals submitted to the Commission in regard to the problems of specific homonymy and the nomenclature of infra-subspecific forms 131–132

Government Agencies, Museums and other Scientific Institutions, Learned Societies and individual zoologists and palaeontologists in all parts of the world who during period 1938–1948 had assisted the work of the Commission by making donations to its funds 32

Secretary-General, Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, for the admirable arrangements made for the meetings of the Commission 647

French authorities of the Congress for the arrangements for the entertainment of members of the Congress and for the hospitality extended to them during the visit to Paris 647

Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., for inviting the Secretary of the Commission to visit Washington and other centres in North America in December 1947, for the purpose of discussing problems of zoological nomenclature with American zoologists in preparation for the Paris Session of the Commission 31

U.N.E.S.C.O. (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation) for substantial grants made towards the work of the Commission for the years 1947 and 1948 32

Communiqué, issue of, by the Commission to the scientific press of the world at the close of the Congress 649–651

Page

composite nominal species, criteria to be adopted in determining identity of, *see Règles*, etc., Article 31.

composition of the Commission, reform of, *see* Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature, Section (c).

constricta Conrad, 1842 (as published in the binominal combination *Nuculites constricta*); placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 400

Consul Hübner, [1806], an invalid " Tentamen " name; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 492, 494

Consul Hübner, [1807] (type species by monotypy: *Papilio fabius* Cramer [1776]); placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 494

cordatus Sowerby, 1813, *Ammonites*, figure 4 on plate 17 of Sowerby's *Mineral Conchology of Great Britain*, Vol. I designated under the plenary powers to be the lectotype of; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 393

cordatus Pennant, 1777, *Echinus*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825 526

placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 528

Coriscus Schrank, 1796, suppressed under the plenary powers for purposes of Article 25, but not for those of Article 34; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 467

Corixa Geoffroy, 1762, validated under the plenary powers and *Corixa geoffroyi* Leach, 1817, similarly designated as type species 369

placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 370

corus Fabricius, 1793 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio corus*); placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 457, 458

Corvus Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered 582

Cory, Professor Ernest N., attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission 6

-costa, compound trivial name ending in noun form, not a homonym of a similiar compound name ending in adjectival form *-costatus, -a, -um* 242

-costatus, -a, -um, see -costa

" co-type," *Recommandation* to be added to *Règles* deprecating use of expression .. 190–191

Cramer, 1775, *Uitlandsche Kapellen* Vol. I., relative priority of names published in, and in (a) von Rottemburg, 1775, *Anmerkungen zu den Hufnagelischen Tabellen der Schmetterlinge* (published in Vol. 6 of *Naturforscher*) (b) [Schiffermüller & Denis], 1775, *Ankündigung eines systematischen Werkes von den Schmetterlingen der Wiener Gegend* (published anonymously) and (c) Fabricius, 1775, *Systema Entomologiae*, to be determined by the Commission 459

Page

creusa Doubleday, [1847] (as published in the binominal combination *Anthocharis creusa*); placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 485

Cuculus Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" to be considered 582

cupido Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio cupido*); placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 457, 458

cuvieri Waterhouse, 1837, *Abrocoma, see Chincilla* Bennett, 1829.

Cyrillic alphabet, transliteration of, new Section relating to, to be added to Second Schedule 229

Cytamoeba Danilewsky, 1891, not available in zoological nomenclature 618

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" .. 619

Cytosporon Danilewsky, 1891, not available in zoological nomenclature 618

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" .. 619

Cytozoon Danilewsky, 1891, not available in zoological nomenclature 618

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" .. 619

Dama Zimmermann, 1780, available under the *Règles*; not to be transferred from Fallow Deer of Europe to Virginia Deer of America pending examination of issues involved .. 551

Danaus Kluk, 1802 (type species selected by Hemming, 1933: *Papilio plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758); placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 494

daplidice Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio daplidice*); placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 458

date of publication, criteria to be adopted for determining, prescribed, *see Règles*, etc., Article 25, provisions relating to date of publication

Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature: decisions taken on, and recommendations adopted in regard to, for submission to the International Congress of Zoology:—

Declarations 1 and 12 (Code of Ethics), to be incorporated in a new Article 167

Declaration 2 (avoidance of issue of separates in advance of the paper concerned), substance of, to be embodied in a *Recommandation* 167–168

Declaration 3 (need for giving a clear indication of date of publication), substance of, and of *Declaration* 8, to be embodied in a *Recommandation* 169–170

Declaration 4 (avoidance of use of intemperate language in discussing zoological nomenclature), to be incorporated in a new Article 167

Page

Declarations rendered by the I.C.Z.N.; etc.—*continued.*

Declaration 5 (Plenary Powers Resolution), *see Règles*, etc., New Article (12).

Declaration 6 (need for indicating a new name as such and for avoiding publishing a name as new on more than one occasion), substance of, to be embodied in *Recommandations* .. 168, 169

Declaration 7 (need for the citation of bibliographical references), substance of, to be embodied in the *Règles* as a new provision .. 170

Declaration 8, *see Declaration* 3

Declarations 9 and 10, subject matter not suitable for incorporation in the *Règles* .. 166

Declaration 11 (need for indicating the systematic position of new taxonomic units), substance of, to be embodied in a *Recommandation* .. 170–171

Declaration 12, *see Declaration* 1.

Declarations 1–12, repeal of, except for historical purposes .. 171

Declarations, this series to be reserved, after the Paris Congress, for proposals for the amendment, etc. of the *Règles* .. 136–137

Declarations to be rendered embodying decisions on the undermentioned matters taken by the International Commission at the Paris Congress:

expressions " grade " and " pseudo-genus ", status to be accorded to .. 293–294

organites and sclerites, rejection of proposal that new system of nomenclature should be introduced for .. 294

" definite bibliographic reference," substitution of revised provision for, in Article 25, *see Règles*, etc., Article 25, Provisio (c).

" definite unambiguous designation of type species, substitution of revised provision for, in Article 25, *see Règles*, etc., Article 25, Proviso (c)

Deflandre, M. G. V., attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission .. 6, 272

Deflandre-Rigaud, Mme. Marthe, attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission .. 272

Delacour, Mr. Jean, attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission .. 6, 62, 230

dentatum Stein, 1858 (as published in the binominal combination *Entodinium dentatum*) declared the type species of *Diplodinium* Schuberg, 1888, and placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " .. 380

deplilans, suppression, under the plenary powers, of all uses of, as a specific trivial name in combination with the generic name *Aplysia* (emend. of *Laplysia*) Linnaeus, 1767, prior to such use by Gmelin in 1791 .. 303

depilans Gmelin, 1791 (as published in the binominal combination *Aplysia depilans*) validation of, under the plenary powers, and to be the name to be used for the species so named; designation of, under the plenary powers, as the type species of *Aplysia* Linnaeus, 1767: placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " .. 303

Page

" designate " and " designation," expressions, in relation to Article 30 to be used in a uniform sense 179

Diadema Gray, 1825, validated under the plenary powers with *Echinometra setosa* Leske, 1778, as type species ; placed on the " Official List of General Names in Zoology " .. 384

Diadema Ranzani, 1817, suppressed under the plenary powers ; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 384

Diadema Schumacher, 1817, suppressed under the plenary powers ; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 384

diana Linnaeus, 1758, *Simia*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Cercopithecus* Linnaeus, 1758 ; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 311

Dictyonota Curtis, 1827, *Dictyonota strichnocera* Fieber, 1844, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of ; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 474

differential characters in descriptions of new taxonomic units, revised provisions relating to, *see Règles*, Article 25, Proviso (c).

Diodontus Curtis, 1834, application for the designation under the plenary powers of *Pemphredon tristis* Van der Linden, 1829, as the type species of, deferred for further information to be obtained 407

Diplodinium Schuberg, 1888 (type species by monotypy : *Entodinium dentatum* Stein, 1858) ; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 380

DISSOTREMATIDAE, GLYIAUCHENIDAE and OPISTHOLEBETIDAE, consideration of relative status of, deferred pending Report by Secretary on general question of family names 401–402

donors of financial assistance towards work of Commission, vote of thanks to, adopted by the Commission 32

dos Passos, Mr. Cyril F., attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission 62, 83, 230, 272, 280

Dougherty, Dr. Ellsworth C., attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission 37, 62, 83, 107, 190, 306, 354, 425

drøbachiensis Müller (O.F.), 1776, *Echinus*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Strongylocentrotus* Brandt, 1835 521

placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 522

Dryas Hübner, [1806], an invalid " Tentamen " name, placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 492, 495

Page

dubius Brandt, 1835, *Cidarites* (*Phyllacanthus*), designated under the plenary powers, in so far as necessary, to be the type species of *Phyllacanthus* Brandt, 1835 521

placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 522

Dymond, Commissioner J. R., absence of, from Paris Session 3

election of, in 1939 as a Commissioner *vice* Commissioner H. B. Fantham (deceased) .. 16

appointment of, to Class 1952 on expiry of term of service of Class 1943 13

Echeneis Linnaeus, 1758, *Echeneis naucrates* (emend. of *neucrates*) Linnaeus, 1758 designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of 538

position of, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " confirmed 539

Echinarachnius Gray, 1825, validated under the plenary powers and *Scutella parma* Lamarck, 1816, similarly designated to be type species ; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 534

Echinarachnius Leske, 1778, and all uses of this name prior to *Echinarachnius* Gray, 1825, suppressed under the plenary powers 534

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 535

Echinocardium Gray, 1825, validated under the plenary powers, in so far as necessary, and *Echinus cordates* Pennant, 1777, similarly designated as type species 526

placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 527

Echinocardium Leske, 1778, in so far as published as a generic name, suppressed under the plenary powers 526

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 528

Echinocrinus Agassiz, 1841, application for suppression of, under the plenary powers, deferred for further information to be obtained 516

Echinocyamus van Phelsum, 1774, validated under the plenary powers, and *Echinocyamus pusillus* Müller (O.F.), 1776, similarly designated as type species ; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 519

Echinodiscus Breynius, 1732, declared without status in zoological nomenclature 534

Echinodiscus Leske, 1778, (type species, by selection by Clark (H.L.) 1911 : *Echinodiscus bisperforatus* Leske, 1778), placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " .. 535

" Editorial Notes " attached to reissues of *Opinions* 1–16, nomenclatorial questions raised in, to be considered in turn 560

Page

Elliot, Right Hon. Walter, acceptance by, of Chairmanship of International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature 31

telegram despatched to, expressing thanks of the Commission for acceptance of Chairmanship of the International Trust 63

Eledone Leach, 1817 (type species, by monotypy: *Octopus moschatus* Lamarck, 1798) placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 589

Ematozoo Antolisei & Angelini, 1890, a subjective synonym of *Laverania* Feletti & Grassi, 1889 615

emendation of names, Secretary to prepare comprehensive Report on Article 19 regarding 141

Emesis Fabricius, 1807, validated under the plenary powers 456

placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " (type species selected by Westwood [1851]: *Hesperia ovidius* Fabricius, 1793 [= *Papilio cereus* Linnaeus, 1767]) 457

Emesis [Illiger], 1807, suppressed under the plenary powers; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 456

Encrinus Schultze, 1760, application for validation of, under the plenary powers with *Encrinus liliiformis* Lamarck, 1801, as type species, to be referred by Secretary to a Crinoid specialist 513

Equus Linnaeus, 1758; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " (type species, by absolute tautonymy: *Equus caballus* Linnaeus, 1758) 581

Erycina Lamarck, 1805, *Erycina pellucida* Lamarck, 1805, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 418

Esaki, Commissioner Teiso, absence of, from Paris Session 3

election of, to Class 1946 on expiry of term of service of Class 1937 10

nomination of, to be a Member of the Class 1955 on the expiry of the term of service of the Class 1946, reservation by Commission regarding attitude towards 13–14

decision not to confirm nomination of, to Class 1955, in order to provide Japanese zoologists with a fresh opportunity of expressing their wishes as to their representation on the Commission consequent upon the political and other changes resulting from the close of the war 18, 19

esperi Kirby, 1871, (as published as a subspecific trivial name in the trinominal combination *Euchloë ausonia* Hübner var. *esperi*); placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 486

Ethics, Code of, incorporation in the *Règles*, *see Règles*, etc., New Article (6).

Euchloë Hübner, [1819]; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " (type species designated under the plenary powers: *Euchloë ausonia* Hübner var. *esperi* Kirby, 1871) 484

Page

Euphydryas Scudder, 1872 (type species designated by Scudder, 1872: *Papilio phaeton* Drury [1773]); placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 494

Euploea Fabricius, 1807, entry on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " confirmed (type species designated under the plenary powers: *Papilio corus* Fabricius, 1793) 457

Euploea [Illiger], 1807, suppressed under the plenary powers; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 456

fabius Cramer, [1776] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio fabius*) placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 496

fabricii Stål, 1868, *Tingis* designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Cataplatus* Spinola, 1837; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 474

Fabricius, 1775, *Systema Entomologiae*, relative priority to be accorded to, *see* Cramer, 1775, *Uitlandsche Kapellen.*

Fabricius (J.C.), terms intermediate between generic and specific trivial names cited in works by, not of subgeneric status as from date of being so published 267

Fabricius, trivial names based on name of, to be formed as *fabricii* not *fabriciusi* 206

falciforme Antolisei & Angelini, 1890 (as published in the binominal combination *Ematozoo falciforme*) suppressed under the plenary powers for all purposes other than Article 35 613

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 620

falciforme Thayer & Hewitson, 1895 (as published in the binominal combination *Haematozoon falciforme*) suppressed under the plenary powers for all purposes other than Article 35 613

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 621

falciparum Welch, 1897, *Haematozoon*, validated under the plenary powers as the name of the Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite; designated under the plenary powers as the the type species of *Laverania* Feletti & Grassi, 1889 614

placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 620

Family names, Secretary to Commission invited to prepare, in consultation with specialists, a comprehensive Report on provisions in the *Règles* relating to, for consideration at the next meeting of the Congress 138, 402

Page

Family names, etc.—*continued*

situation created where Article 4 leads to the formation of two or more families with identical names, question to be dealt with in Secretary's Report.. 243–244

method to be followed in determining family name to be used where two or more previously established names are united on taxonomic grounds 244–245, 402

communication on nomenclature of supergeneric groups submitted by Professor R. Jeannel to be included in the *dossier* to be studied by the Secretary in preparing Report on general question 273

communication on, submitted by Professor Robert L. Usinger, to be included in the *dossier* to be studied by the Secretary in preparing Report on general question.. .. 273

Fantham, Commissioner H. B., death of, reported; adoption by Commission of Resolution of regret at death of 9

fasciata Poiret, 1789 (as published in the binominal combination *Aplysia fasciata*), question of use of plenary powers to determine species to which applicable, deferred, and to be re-submitted by the Secretary after the close of the Paris Congress 304

feisthameli Duponchel, 1832 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio feisthameli*); placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology".. .. 499

Fibularia Lamarck, 1816, validated under the plenary powers, and *Fibularia ovulum* Lamarck, 1816, similarly designated as type species; placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 519

Figures and Descriptions of Petrifactions collected in Derbyshire, 1793, by Martin (W.), not available under the *Règles* 452

financial and administrative problems of the Commission, *see* Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature, Section (*e*).

fimbria Linnaeus, 1767 (as published in the binominal combination *Tethys fimbria*) validation of, under the plenary powers, and to be the name to be used for the species so named; designation of, under the plenary powers, as the type species of *Tethys* Linnaeus, 1767; placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" .. 303

first reviser, principle of, *see* page precedence.

Fischer-Piette, Professor E., *Secretary-General to the Congress*, attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission 272

Flebotomus Rondani, 1840, emendation of, to *Phlebotomus* under the plenary powers .. 359

Formica Linnaeus, 1758 (type species declared to be by selection by Curtis, 1839: *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758); placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" .. 409

Fossil invertebrates, fragments (organites and sclerites) of, suggested new system of nomenclature for. *See* "organites".

Fringilla Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" to be considered 582

Page

Frisch (J. L.), *Das Natur-System der vierfüssigen Thiere*, 1775. declared unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes 549

Fulica Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered 582

galea Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Buccinum galea*) placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 310

Gastrodes Westwood, 1840, *Cimex abietum* Bergroth, 1914, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 473

geinitzianus Barrande, 1850 (as published in the binominal combination *Gladiolites geinitzianus*) placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 379

gender of generic names, Article to be inserted in *Règles* prescribing compliance with rules for determining, to be specified in a new Schedule to be added to the *Règles* 249–250

entries relating to, to be inserted in the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " .. 341

generic names, method to be used for determining gender of 248–249

" genotype ", insertion of a *Recommandation* deprecating use of expression.. 300

Geoffroy (E. L.), 1762, *Hist. abrég. Ins. Env. Paris*, not an available work for nomenclatorial purposes; Secretary invited to confer with specialists with a view to ubimssion of applications relating to generic names, published in, the disappearance of which would be likely to lead to confusion 368

Geographische Geschichte des Menschen, und der allgemein verbreiteten vierfüssigen Thiere, nebst einer hieher gehörigen zoologischen Weltcharte, 1778–1783, by Zimmermann (A. E. W. von) declared available for nomenclatorial purposes 548

geoffroyi Leach, 1817, *Corixa*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Corixa* Geoffroy, 1762 369

question of placing of, on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology ", deferred for further information to be obtained by the Secretary 370

Gesner, (J.), 1758, *Tractatus physicus de petrificatis* suppressed, under the plenary powers, so far as necessary, for nomenclatorial purposes 420

Ghigi, Professor A., attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission.. 6

Giraffa, generic name, first published in Brünnich, 1771, *Zoologiae Fundamenta*, if Brisson, 1762, *Regnum animale* (ed. 2), found to be not available 314

Page

Gisin, M. Hermann, attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission.. .. .. 6, 272

Gladiolites Barrande, 1850, suppressed under the plenary powers for purposes of Article 25 but not for those of Article 34; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 379

glandon Prunner, 1798 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio glandon*) placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 486

Gohar, Dr. H. A. F., attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission.. 62

Gordon, Dr. Isabella, attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission .. 306, 354

Gorytes Latreille, [Sept.] 1804 application for the validation of, under the plenary powers, deferred for further information to be obtained 411

" grade ", suggested recognition of, as a nomenclatorial category 273–274

expression " grade " available as a technical term but not to be recognised in the *Règles* as a nomenclatorial category 293–294

granulatus Linnaeus, 1758, *Carabus*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Carabus* Linnaeus, 1758; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 446

Graptolithus Linnaeus, 1768, suppressed under the plenary powers for purposes of Article 25 but not for those of Article 34; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 377

Gronovius, [1763–1781], *Zoophylacium Gronovianum*, Meuschen's index to, declared to be unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes 504

group names between genus and species level, subject to certain conditions to be treated as subgeneric names, *see Règles*, etc., New Article (5) 443

Gryphaea Lamarck, 1801, question of type species of, deferred until after the close of the Paris Congress 306–307

GYLIAUCHENIDAE, *see* DISSOTREMATIDAE.

Gymnotus Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered 582

Haemamoeba Feletti & Grassi, 1889, declared to be invalid 615

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 619

Page

Häematomonas Osler, 1886, declared to be a cheironym 617

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" .. 620

Hämatophyllum Metschnikoff, 1887, type species of, designated under the plenary powers 613

declared to be invalid 615

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" .. 620

Haematozoon Thayer & Hewitson 1895, a subjective synonym of *Laverania* Feletti & Grassi, 1889 615

Haemocytosporon Danilewsky, 1891, not available in Zoological Nomenclature 618

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" .. 620

Haemosporidium Lewkowicz, 1897, declared to be invalid 616

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" .. 620

Hall, Professor E. Raymond, attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission 62, 83, 190, 230, 239, 306, 354

Hamadryas Hübner, [1806], an invalid "Tentamen" name, placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" 493–495

Hankó, Commissioner Bela, absence of, from Paris Session 3

election of, in 1937, as a Commissioner *vice* Commissioner G. Horváth (resigned) .. 15

election of, to Class 1946, on expiry of term of service of Class 1937 10

appointment of, to Class 1955 on expiry of term of service of Class 1946.. 13

Harpactus Shuckard, 1837, application for the validation of, under the plenary powers, deferred for further information to be obtained 411

Harpalus Latreille, [1802–1803], application for the designation, under the plenary powers, of *Carabus aeneus* Fabricius, 1775, as type species of, deferred for further information to be obtained 446–448

Hayes, Professor W. P., attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission 62

Helicopis Fabricius, 1807, entry on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" confirmed (type species selected by Scudder, 1875 : *Papilio cupido* Linnaeus, 1758) .. 457

Helicopis [Illiger], 1807, suppressed under the plenary powers ; placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" 456

Hemerobius Linnaeus, 1758, *Hemerobius humulinus* Linnaeus, 1758, designated under the plenary powers to be type species of ; placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 396

Page

Hemming, Secretary Francis, in attendance at Paris Session 2

assumption, in absence of President and Vice-President, of Acting Presidency for duration of Paris Session 1

election of, as Secretary in 1936 9

appointment of, to Class 1949 on expiry of term of service of Class 1940 13

reappointment of, as Secretary on reappointment to Membership of the Commission in 1941 consequent upon the formation of Class 1949. 16

nomination of, to Class 1958 on expiry of term of service of Class 1949 19

nomination of, to be a Member of the Commission for a further term on abolition of the system of 9-year Classes in the membership of the Commission and consequent reversal of decision to establish a Class 1958 46

nomination of, as Secretary for a further period 23

nomination of, to be a member of the Editorial Committee of Three charged with the duty of supervising the preparation of the text of the *Règles* as revised by the Paris Congress 630

congratulations by Commission to, in respect of investigation into problem of binary nomenclature 66

congratulations by Commission to, in respect of investigation into the nomenclature of the human malaria parasites 624

attendance by, at Meetings of the Commission 1, 6, 37, 62, 83, 107, 190, 230, 239, 272, 280, 306, 354, 425, 649

Rising Vote of Thanks to, for services as Secretary to the Commission and as Acting President during the Paris Session 645

approval by, of Minutes of Paris Meetings xiv

Hemming, Mrs. M. F. W., in attendance as *Personal Assistant to the Secretary* 6, 37, 62, 83, 107, 190, 230, 239, 272, 280, 306, 354, 649

adoption by Commission of Resolution of thanks for work on problems of specific homonymy and nomenclature of infra-specific forms 131–132

"Hildesheim List" suppressed under the plenary powers for nomenclatorial purposes .. 487

Hindle, Dr. Edward, appointment of, as an Alternate Commissioner *vice* President Karl Jordan 4

attendance by, at Meetings of the Commission 6, 272, 280, 649

approval by, of Minutes of Paris Meetings xiv

"holotype", expression to be introduced into the *Règles*, and defined 185–186

hominis Danilewsky, 1891 (as published in the binominal combination *Laverania hominis*) not available in zoological nomenclature 618

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 621

Page

homonymy in generic names, criteria to be adopted in determining whether any pair of similar names are homonyms of one another, *see Règles*, etc., Article 34.

homonymy in specific names, criteria to be adopted in determining whether any pair of similar names are homonyms of one another, *see Règles*, etc., Articles 35 & 36.

Hope, (F. W.), [1836], *see* " Buprestidae ".

Hübner, (J.), *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge*, terms intermediate between generic and specific trivial names cited on legends to plates in volume 1 of, not of subgeneric status on that account 290

Hübner, (J.), *Systematisch-alphabetisches Verzeichniss*, terms intermediate between generic and specific trivial names cited in, not of subgeneric status on that account 290

Hübner, (J.), [1806] " *Tentamen* ", valid names of genera for certain species cited in, placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ; procedure to be adopted for other names determined 488–496

Human Malaria Parasites, determination of scientific names of 594–624

humulinus Linnaeus, 1758, *Hemerobius*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Hemermobius* Linnaeus, 1758 396

placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 397

Hyaena Brisson, 1762, proposed addition of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " deferred until decision taken on availability of names in Brisson, 1762, *Regnum animale* (ed. 2) 314, 315

Hygriobia Latreille, 1804, emended to *Hygrobia* under Article 19 460

Hygrobia (emend. of *Hygriobia*) Latreille, 1804 (type species by monotypy: *Dytiscus hermanni* Fabricius, 1775) placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " .. 460

hylas Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio hylas*) placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 458

hypothetical forms, names given to, to have no status in zoological nomenclature, *see Règles*, etc., Article 25, general provisions.

I.C. (48) Memoranda (documents submitted to the Commission during its Paris Session)

I.C.(48)1 considered 27–28

I.C.(48)2 considered 28–31

Page

I.C.(48) Memoranda, etc.—*continued.*

I.C.(48)3 considered .. 35, 37–46

I.C.(48)4 considered .. 49–59

I.C.(48)5 considered .. 63–66

I.C.(48)6 considered .. 66–78

I.C.(48)7 considered .. 78–80

I.C.(48)8 considered .. 97–105, 107–131

I.C.(48)9 considered .. 81–82, 83–96

I.C.(48)10 considered .. 132–137

I.C.(48)11 considered .. 137–166

I.C.(48)12 considered .. 171–188, 190–195

I.C.(48)13 considered .. 166–171

I.C.(48)14 considered .. 195–229

I.C.(48)15 considered .. 239–271

I.C.(48)16 considered .. 288–300

I.C.(48)17 considered .. 323–342

I.C.(48)18 considered .. 342–352

I.C.(48)19 considered .. 354–364

I.C.(48)20 considered .. 283–288

documents of I.C.(48) Series to be published in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature" .. 342

icarus Cramer, [1775], *Papilio,* see *icarus* Rottemburg [1775], *Papilio*

icarus Rottemburg, [1775], *Papilio* (type species of *Polyommatus* Latreille, 1804) relative priority of, in relation to *icarus* Cramer, [1775], *Papilio* (type species of *Castnia* Fabricius, 1807) to be determined in light of special Report to be prepared by Secretary .. 485

idas Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio idas*) suppressed under the plenary powers .. 479

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 480

idas Linnaeus, 1761 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio idas*) validated and application of, determined under the plenary powers .. 479

placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" .. 480

ilia [Schiffermüller & Denis], 1775 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio ilia*) placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" .. 542

immaculata Grassi, 1891 (as published in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba immaculata*) available for an avian but not for a human malaria parasite .. 616

Page

immaculata Grassi, 1891, etc.—*continued.*

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" (as a name for a human malaria parasite) 621

"indicate" and "indication", expressions, in relation to Article 30, to be used in a uniform sense 179

"indication", revised definition of meaning of, in relation to generic names, *see Règles*, Article 25, Proviso (a).

"infra-subspecific form", expression, to be inserted in *Règles* and defined 89–90

infra-subspecific forms, introduction of rules governing naming of, *see Règles*, etc., New Article (1).

"infra-subspecific name", expression, to be inserted in the *Règles* and defined 89–90

ingens Owen, 1844 (as published in the binominal combination *Dinornis ingens* an objective synonym of *novaezealandiae* Owen, 1843 as published in the binominal combination *Dinornis novaezealandiae*); placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 450

intemperate language in the discussion of zoological nomenclature, introduction of an Article prohibiting, *see Règles*, etc., New Article (8).

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, *see* Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature.

iris Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio iris*), application of, determined under the plenary powers 542

placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 458

irregularis Kruse, 1892 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*) declared to be a technical designation and not a trivial name .. 617

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 621

irregularis Sakharov, 1892, *Haemamoeba febris*, declared to be a cheironym 618

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 621

Jacques, M. Denis, attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission 62

Jaczewski, Commissioner T., election as a Commissioner in 1939, *vice* Commissioner Candido Bolivar y Pieltain (resigned) 16

Page

Jaczewski, Commissioner T., etc. (*continued*).

  election of, to Class 1946 on expiry of term of service of Class 1937 10

  postponement of nomination of, as a Member of the Class 1955 on expiry of term of service of Class 1946, owing to impossibility of ascertaining present whereabouts .. 13–14

  membership of Commission of, declared vacated owing to impossibility of ascertaining whereabouts, and successor appointed 14

Jeannel, Professor R., attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission 272

Jespersen, Dr. P., attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission 272

Jordan, President Karl, message of regret from, at inability to attend Paris Session owing to total deafness 1

  assumption by, in 1939, of extraordinary powers for the duration of the emergency to preserve the existence of the Commission 10–13

  appointment of, to Class 1949 on expiry of term of service of Class 1940 13

  re-appointment of, as President on re-appointment to Membership of Commission in 1941 consequent upon the formation of Class 1949 16

  nomination of, to Class 1958 on expiry of term of service of Class 1949 19

  request from, to be excused from nomination as President for a further term consequent upon total deafness 19–22

  appreciation by Commission of distinguished services rendered by 21–22

  nomination of, as a mark of esteem, to proposed new Office of Honorary Life President; Acting President requested to despatch telegram to, expressing regret by Commission at resignation and conveying affection and esteem in which held in 22

  nomination of, to be a Member of the Commission for a further term, on abolition of the system of 9-year Classes in the membership of the Commission and consequent reversal of decision to establish a Class 1958 46

  text of telegram to, despatched by Acting President 63

Jorge, Professor Arthur Ricardo, appointment of, as an Alternate Commissioner *vice* Commissioner A. do Amaral 4

  attendance by, at Meetings of the Commission 280

  approval by, of Minutes of Paris Meetings xiv

Kirby, Professor Harold, appointment of, as an Alternate Commissioner *vice* Commissioner Norman R. Stoll 4

  assumption by, of Acting Chairmanship during portion of Fourteenth Meeting of Commission.

  attendance by, at Meetings of the Commission .. 6. 62, 83, 107, 190, 230, 272, 280, 425, 649

  approval by, of Minutes of Paris Meetings xiv

Page

Koch (C.L.), 1835–1842, *Deutschlands Crustaceen, Myriapoden und Arachniden*, determination of type species, or species eligible for selection as type species, of genera published in 374

1842, *Übersicht des Arachnidensystems*, single species figured in, for any given genus, to be accepted as type species, but the Commission prepared to consider applications for use of plenary powers in individual cases where confusion would arise from this decision 375

laniger Molina, 1782 (as published in the binominal combination *Mus laniger*), *see Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829.

Laplysia Linnaeus, 1767, emendation under Article 19 of, to *Aplysia* 302

Latiorina Tutt, 1909 (type species, by designation under the plenary powers: *Papilio glandon* Prunner, 1798); placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 484

laverani Labbé, 1894 (as published in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba laverani*) suppressed under the plenary powers for all purposes other than Article 35 613

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 621

Laverania Feletti & Grassi, 1889, validated under the plenary powers; *Haematozoon falciparum* Welch, 1897, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of 614

particulars in regard to, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " confirmed and clarified 619

Lebia Latreille [1802–1803], application for the designation, under the plenary powers, of *Buprestis marginatus* Fourcroy, 1785, as type species of, deferred for further information to be obtained 447

" lectotype," expression to be introduced into the *Règles*, and defined 185–186

Leiodes Latreille, 1796, *see Liodes* Heyden, 1826.

Lemche, Dr. Henning, appointment of, to be an Alternate Commissioner *vice* Commissioner J. R. Dymond 283

nomination of, to be a Member of the Commission *vice* Commissioner Th. Mortensen (resigned) as from close of Paris Congress 282

attendance by, at Meetings of the Commission 6, 62, 83, 107, 190, 230, 239, 272, 280, 306, 354, 425, 649

approval by, of Minutes of Paris Meetings xiv

Lemonias Hübner, [1806], an invalid " Tentamen " name, placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 493–495

Page

leporina, suppression, under the plenary powers, of, as a permissible trivial name in the genus *Tethys* Linnaeus, 1767 303

ligniperda Latreille, 1802 (as published in the binominal combination *Formica ligniperda*), placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 410

limacina, suppression, under the plenary powers, of, as a permissible trivial name in the genus *Tethys* Linnaeus, 1767 303

Limenitis Fabricius, 1807 (type species selected by Dalman, 1816 : *Papilio populi* Linnaeus, 1758) placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology".. 494

Limnas Hübner, [1806], an invalid "Tentamen" name, placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" 493–494

Limulus Müller, 1785, Secretary to submit Report on, with reference to the earlier name *Xiphosura* Brünnich, 1771 311–312

Linnaeus, C.

terms intermediate between generic and specific trivial names cited in works by, published subsequent to 10th edition (like those published in the 10th edition) of the *Systema Naturae* (1758) not of subgeneric status in virtue of being so published (extension of *Opinion* 124) 266

trivial name based on name of, to be formed *linnaei* and not *linnaeusi* or *linnei* .. 206

Liodes Heyden, 1826, declared an invalid homonym of *Leiodes* Latreille, 1796 ; placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" 421

literature-recording serials, authors to be requested to notify to, publication of papers containing names new for taxonomic units or affecting the status of previously published names 94, 119, 122, 126, 215

littoralis Linnaeus, 1758, *Cimex*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Salda* Fabricius, 1803 468

placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 469

Lobophora Agassiz (L.), 1841 ; placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" 535

Loligo Schneider, 1784, declared to be a cheironym possessing no status under the *Règles* ; placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" .. 589

Lomatoceras Bronn, 1834, suppressed under the plenary powers for purposes of Article 25 but not for those of Article 34 ; placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" 378

Loricata, *see* Polyplacophora.

Lovenechinus Jackson, 1912, application for validation of, with *Oligoporus missouriensis* Jackson, 1896, as type species, Secretary to confer with specialist regarding 513

Page

Loxia Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered 582

Lutra Brisson, 1762, proposed addition of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " deferred until decision taken on availability of names in Brisson, 1762, *Regnum animale* (ed. 2) 314, 315

Lycaeides Hübner, [1819], placed on the " Offiial List of Generic Names in Zoology " (type species designated under the plenary powers : *Papilio argyrognomon* Bergstrasser [1779]) 484

mabouya Lacépède, 1788, *Lacertus*, type species of *Mabuya* Fitzinger, 1826, by absolute tautonymy ; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " .. 356

Mabuya Fitzinger, 1826, type species of, *Lacertus mabouya* Lacépède, 1788, by absolute tautonymy ; erroneous statement in *Opinion* 92 that *Scincus sloani* Daudin, 1803, type species, to be deleted and entry relating to type species of, in " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be corrected 356

mcfarlandi Cockerell, 1902 (as published in the binominal combination *Chromodoris mcfarlandi*) emended to *macfarlandi* under Article 19 431

machaon Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio machaon*) placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 496

Macropis Panzer, [1806–1809], application for the validation of, under the plenary powers, deferred for further information to be obtained 411

Maire, M. V., question of specimens eligible for selection as lectotypes of certain species of ammonites named by 500

Malaria Parasites, Human, determination of scientific names of 594–624

malariae Feletti & Grassi, 1889, *Haemamoeba*, validated under the plenary powers as the name of the Quartan Malaria Parasite ; designated under the plenary powers as the type species of *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885 ; designated under the plenary powers as the type species of *Hämatophyllum* Metschnikoff, 1887. 613

placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 620

malariae Feletti & Grassi, 1889 (as published in the binominal combination *Laverania malariae*) (in so far as this was published as a new name and not as the trivial name *malariae* Laveran, 1881) suppressed under the plenary powers 613

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 629

malariae Laveran, 1881 (as published in the binominal combination *Oscillaria malariae*) suppressed under the plenary powers 612

Page

malariae Laveran, 1881, etc. (*continued*).

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 622

malariae Marchiafava & Celli, 1885 (as published in the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*) suppressed under the plenary powers 613

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 622

Malignant Tertian Malaria Parasite, determination of scientific name of 614

malvae Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio malvae*) ; placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 496

Manatus Brünnich, 1771, Secretary to submit Report on 313

Mancipium Hübner, [1806], an invalid "Tentamen" name, placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" 494,495

Mansour, Professor Kamel, appointment of, as an Alternate Commissioner *vice* Commissioner B. Hankó 282

attendance by, at Meetings of the Commission 6, 37, 280, 306, 354

approval by, of Minutes of Paris Meetings xiv

manuscript name ; a name which, prior to being published with an indication, had acquired an irregular currency as a manuscript name, to rank for priority from date of being published with an indication and to be attributed to the author by whom so published 259–60, 563

maritimus Scopoli, 1763, *Cimex*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Beosus* Amyot & Serville, 1843 ; placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 474

Martin (W.), *Figures and Descriptions of Petrifications collected in Derbyshire*, 1793, not available under the *Règles* ; *Petrificata Derbiensia*, 1809, not available under the *Règles* 452

sympathetic consideration to be given to applications for the use of the plenary powers to validate any well-known name which might be invalidated under above decision .. 452

Mechanitis Fabricius, 1807, validated under the plenary powers 456

placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology (type species selected by Scudder, 1875 : *Papilio polymnia* Linnaeus, 1758) 457

Mechanitis [Illiger], 1807, suppressed under the plenary powers : placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" 456

Megachile Latreille, 1802, *Apis centuncularis* Linnaeus, 1758, declared to be the type species of, by selection by Curtis, 1828 ; placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 413

Page

Meigen, 1800, *Nouvelle Classification des Mouches à deux Ailes;* Report by Secretary to Commission on developments since 1935 noted; procedure for dealing with names published in, determined 552–558

Meleagris Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered 582

Meles Brisson, 1762, proposed addition of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " deferred until decision taken on availability of names in Brisson, 1762, *Regnum animale* (ed. 2) 315

membership of the Commission, changes in, during period 1935–1948, *see* Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature, Section (f).

Merops Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered 582

Metcalf, Professor Z. P., appointment of, as an Alternate Commissioner *vice* Vice-President James L. Peters 4

attendance by, at Meetings of the Commission 6, 62, 83, 649

communication entitled " Static versus Dynamic Nomenclature " by, not submitted through absence of

approval by, of Minutes of Paris Meetings xiv

Methocha Latreille, [March] 1804, application for the use of the plenary powers to validate *Methoca ichneumonides* Latreille [Sept.] 1804 as the type species of, and to emend to *Methoca* deferred for further information to be obtained 413, 415

Meuschen (F.C.), index by, to the *Zoophylacium Gronovianum* of Gronovius, declared to be unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes 504

Meuschen (F.C.), 1788, *Museum Gronovianum* declared not available for nomenclatorial purposes 573

minor Lubbock, 1862, *Macrotoma*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Tomoceras* Nicolet, 1842 506

placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 507

Minutes of Meetings of the Paris Session of the Commission, arrangements for preparation and publication of, *see* Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature, Section (h).

misidentified type species, procedure to be adopted in relation to 158–159

Moehring (P.N.G.), 1752, *Avium Genera* translation of by Nozeman and Vosmaer (published in 1758 as *Geslachten der Vogelen*) declared not available for nomenclatorial purposes 568

moelleri Rauser-Chernoussova, 1937 (as published in the binominal combination *Schwagerina moelleri*); placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " .. 464

Page

Moera Michelin, 1855; placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" 528

Moira Agassiz (A.), 1872, *Spatangus atropos* Lamarck, 1816, designated under the plenary powers, in so far as necessary, to be the type species of 527

placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 528

Monograpsus Geinitz, 1852, name to be emended to *Monograptus* 378

Monograptus (emend of *Monograpsus*) Geinitz, 1852, validated under the plenary powers with *Lomatoceras priodon* Bronn, 1834, as type species; placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 378

Monoprion Barrande, 1850, suppressed under the plenary powers for purposes of Article 25 but not for those of Article 34; placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" 378

monsters, Linnaean system not available for naming of; attention of teratologists to be drawn to inconvenience arising from misuse of *Règles* for the naming of monsters .. 364

morrisoni Townsend, 1915 (as published in the binominal combination *Phoranthella morrisoni*) declared invalid; placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 383

Morrison-Scott, Mr. T. C. S., attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission .. 62, 230, 272, 280, 306, 354

Mortensen, Commissioner Th., absence of, from Paris Session on account of ill-health .. 2

election of, in post-war period as a Member of the Commission *vice* Commissioner J. Pellegrin (deceased) 16

resignation of, on grounds of ill-health, accepted by Commission with regret 2, 19

Acting President requested to despatch telegram to, expressing sympathy and good wishes of the Commission 3

text of telegram to, despatched by Acting President 63

moschatus Lamarck, 1798 (as published in the binominal combination *Octopus moschatus*); placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 590

Moschites Schneider, 1784, declared to be a cheironym possessing no status under the *Règles*; placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" 589

moschites Schneider, 1784 (as published in the binominal combination *Octopodia moschites*) suppressed under the plenary powers 588

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 590

Motacilla Linnaeus, 1785, question of admission of, to "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" to be considered 582

Page

Museum Gronovianum, 1788, index to, by Meuschen (F.C.), declared not available for nomenclatorial purposes .. 573

Nabis Latreille, [1802–1803], entry on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " (Opinion 104) confirmed .. 467

najas De Geer, 1773, *Cimex*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Aquarius* Schellenberg, 1800 : placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " .. 473–474

Najas Hübner, [1806], an invalid " Tentamen " name ; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 493–495

Natur-System der vierfüssigen Thiere (*Das*), 1775, by Frisch (J.L.) declared unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes .. 549

Naucoris Geoffroy, 1762, question of validation of, under the plenary powers to be considered by the Commission on receipt of a Report by the Secretary .. 370

naucrates (emend. of *neucrates*) (as published in the binominal combination *Echeneis neucrates*) ; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " .. 539

Nautilus Schneider, 1784, declared to be a cheironym possessing no status under the *Règles* ; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 589

nautilus Schneider, 1784 (as published in the binominal combination *Octopodia nautilus*) suppressed under the plenary powers .. 588

  placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " .. 590

Necator (emend. by Sclater & Saunders, 1896, of *Nicator*) Finsch & Hartlaub, 1870, suppressed under the plenary powers .. 301

Necator Stiles, 1903, validated under the plenary powers, and position of, on " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " confirmed .. 300–301

Neotypes, question of recognition of, as a class of type specimen to be the subject of a Report to be prepared by the Secretary to the Commission in consultation with specialists .. 191–193

  misleading reference to, in *Opinion* 126, cancellation of .. 297

Neptis Fabricius, 1807, validated under the plenary powers .. 456

  placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology (type species selected by Crotch 1872 : *Papilio aceris* Esper [1783] [*Papilio hylas* Linnaeus, 1758, ssp.]) .. 457

Page

Neptis [Illiger], 1807, suppressed under the plenary powers; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 456

Nereis Hübner, [1806], an invalid " Tentamen " name; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 492–495

neucrates Linnaeus, 1758, (as published in the binominal combination *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758) emended to *naucrates* under Article 19 539

designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758 .. 538

Nesbitt, Dr. H. H. J., attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission .. 272, 306, 354

nomen dubium, the name of a nominal species, when the taxonomic species represented thereby cannot be recognised 76

a name not exempt from the provisions of the Law of Homonymy on the ground that the older published identical name is a *nomen dubium* 398–399

nomen nudum, a name published without an " indication " 399

a name originally published as a *nomen nudum*, on later being published with an " indication " to rank for priority from date of being so published and to be attributed to the author by whom so published 259–260, 563

" nomenclature binaire ", Report on meaning of expression 63–66

" nominal genus ", expression defined 179–180

" nominal species ", expression defined 179–180

nominotypical subspecies of a polytypic species, introduction of rules governing naming of, *see Règles*, etc., New Article (3).

non-scientific press, *Recommandation* to be inserted deprecating publication of new names in, *see Règles*, etc., Article 25, provisions relating to publication.

Notozus Forster, 1853, application for the validation of, under the plenary powers, deferred for further information to be obtained 413, 415

novaezealandiae Owen, 1843, *Dinornis*, selection of a lectotype of, by Lydekker 1891, declared to be in conformity with Article 31 449

placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 450

Nozeman and Vosmaer, 1758, *Geslachten der Vogelen*, declared not available for nomenclatorial purposes 568

Nymphalis Kluk, 1802 (type species selected by Hemming, 1933 : *Papilio polychloros* Linnaeus, 1758): placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 495

Page

Nymphidium Fabricius, 1807, entry on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" confirmed (type species selected by Crotch, 1872 : *Papilio caricae* Linnaeus, 1758) .. 458

Nymphidium [Illiger], 1807, suppressed under the plenary powers ; placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" 456

Nysso Latreille, 1796, application for the use of the plenary powers to emend to *Nysson* deferred for further information to be obtained 414, 415

Octopodia Schneider, 1784, suppressed under the plenary powers 588

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" .. 589

Octopus Cuvier, [1797] (type species by absolute tautonymy, under *Opinion* 16 : *Octopus vulgaris* (correction of *vulgare*) Cuvier, [1797]) placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 589

Odynerus Latreille, [1802–1803], application for the designation, under the plenary powers, of *Vespa spinipes* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species of, deferred for further information to be obtained 414, 415

offence, political, religious or personal, zoological nomenclature not to be used for giving 193–194

Offices of the Commission, changes in, during period 1935–1948, *see* Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature, Section (g).

"Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology," generic names suppressed under the plenary powers or declared to be invalid or non-existent to be recorded in 334

to be recorded in a Schedule to the *Règles* 334

"Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology," names placed on, during Paris Session.

Apatura [Illiger], 1807 456

Arachnoides Klein, 1778 535

Belone Oken, 1815 428

Brassolis [Illiger], 1807 456

Brenaus Panzer-Jurine, [1801–1804] 407

Brissus Dahl, 1823 .. .. 526, 528

Brissus Leske, 1778 528

Brissus Link, 1807 .. .. 526, 528

Page

" Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology," names placed on, during Paris Session (*continued*).

Brissus Modeer, 1793 .. 526, 528
Brissus Müller (O.F.), 1781 .. 526, 528
Brissus Oken, 1815 .. 526, 528
Brissus as used by any other author prior to Gray, 1825 .. 526, 528
Bryssus Dejean, 1821 .. 526, 528
Castnia [Illiger], 1807 .. 456
Cercopithecus Brünnich, 1771 .. 311
Clavellaria Lamarck, 1801 .. 404
Clavellarius Olivier, 1789 .. 404
Consul Hübner, [1806] .. 492, 495
Coriscus Schrank, 1796 .. 467
Cytamoeba Danilewsky, 1891 .. 619
Cytosporon Danilewsky, 1891 .. 619
Cytozoon Danilewsky, 1891 .. 619
Diadema Ranzani, 1817 .. 384
Diadema Schumacher, 1817 .. 384
Dryas Hübner, [1806] .. 492, 495
Echinarachnius Leske, 1778 .. 535
Echinarachnius as used by any other author prior to Gray, 1825 .. 535
Echinocardium Leske, 1778 .. 526
Emesis [Illiger], 1807 .. 456
Euploea [Illiger], 1807 .. 456
Gladiolites Barrande, 1850 .. 379
Graptolithus Linnaeus, 1768 .. 377
Haemamoeba Feletti & Grassi, 1889 .. 619
Haematomonas Osler, 1886 .. 620
Hamadryas Hübner, [1806] .. 493, 495
Hämatophyllum Metschnikoff, 1887 .. 620
Haemocytosporon Danilewsky, 1891 .. 620
Haemosporidium Lewkowicz, 1897 .. 620
Heliccoplis [Illiger], 1807 .. 456
Latiorina Tutt ,1909 .. 484

Page

"Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology," names placed on, during Paris Session (*continued*).

Lemonias Hübner, [1806] 493, 495
Limnas Hübner, [1806] 493, 495
Liodes Heyden, 1826 421
Lobophora Agassiz (L.), 1841 535
Loligo Schneider, 1784 589
Lomatoceras Bronn, 1834 378
Mancipium Hübner, [1806] 494, 495
Mechanitis [Illiger], 1807 456
Moera Michelin, 1855 528
Monoprion Barrande, 1850 378
Moschites Schneider, 1784 589
Najas Hübner, [1806] 493, 495
Nautilus Schneider, 1784 589
Neptis [Illiger], 1807 456
Nereis Hübner, [1806] 492, 495
Nymphidium [Illiger], 1807 456
Octopodia Schneider, 1784 589
Oreas Hübner, [1806] 492, 495
Orpheides Hübner, [1819] 484
Oscillaria Laveran, 1881 620
Ozoena Rafinesque, 1814 589
Phoranthella Townsend, 1915 383
Polypus Leach, 1817 589
Polypus Schneider, 1784 589
Pompilus Schneider, 1784 590
Pontia [Illiger], 1807 456
Porina Walker, 1856 357
Potamis Hübner, [1806] 492, 495
Princeps, Hübner, [1806] 493, 495
Prospatangus Lambert, 1902 528
Raphistoma Rafinesque, 1815 428
Remora Forster, 1771 539

Page

"Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology," names placed on, during Paris Session (*continued*).

Remora Gouan, 1770 539

Rusticus Hübner, [1806] 494, 495

Sepia Schneider, 1784 590

Sepiola Schneider, 1784 590

Spatangus Leske, 1778 .. .. 526, 528

Spatangus Modeer, 1793 .. .. 526, 528

Spatangus as used by any other author prior to Gray, 1825 .. .. .. 526, 528

Spilothyrus Duponchel, 1835 484

Teleosteus Volger, 1860 430

Teuthis Schneider, 1784 590

Thymele Fabricius, 1807 458

Thymele [Illiger], 1807 456

Urania [Illiger], 1807 456

Urbanus Hübner, [1806] 494, 495

(*Note :* Under the decision by which the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" was established, every generic name which has been, or in future is, rejected or declared to be invalid is automatically to be placed on that "Index." In addition, therefore, to the names cited in the foregoing list, certain names rejected earlier during the Paris Session and also all names rejected in *Opinions* published prior to that Session were also placed on the "Official Index" under the foregoing decision taken during the Paris Session.)

"Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology".

trivial names suppressed under the plenary powers or declared to be invalid or non-existent to be recorded in 334

to be included in a Schedule to the *Règles* 334

"Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology", names placed on, during Paris Session

Trivial name placed on "Official Index" (1)	*Combination in which trivial name in Col.* (1) *originally published* (2)	
arenarius Edwards, 1771	*Cancer arenarius*	578
aristolochiae Pallas, as published prior to 1780	*Papilio aristolochiae*	545
ascanius Linnaeus, 1768	*Papilio ascanius*	545
coeruleus Müller (O.F.), 1785	*Cyclops coeruleus*	377
falciforme Antolisei & Angelini, 1890	*Ematazoo falciforme*	620
falciforme Thayer & Hewitson, 1895	*Haematozoon falciforme*	621
hominis Danilewsky, 1891	*Laverania hominis*	621
idas Linnaeus, 1758	*Papilio idas*	480
immaculata Grassi, 1891 (as applied to a human malaria parasite)	*Haemamoeba immaculata*	621

' Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology," names placed on, during Paris Session (*continued*).

Trivial name placed on " Official List " (1)	*Combination in which trivial name in Col.* (1) *originally published* (2)	*Page*
ingens Owen, 1844	*Dinornis ingens*	450
irregularis Kruse, 1892	*Plasmodium malariae irregularis*	621
irregularis Sakharov, 1892	*Haemamoeba febris irregularis*	621
laverani Labbé, 1894	*Haemamoeba laverani*	621
malariae Feletti & Grassi, 1889	*Laverania malariae*	621
malariae Laveran, 1881	*Oscillaria malariae*	622
malariae Marchiafava & Celli, 1885	*Plasmodium malariae*	622
morrisoni Townsend, 1915	*Phoranthella morrisoni*	383
moschites Schneider, 1784	*Octopodia moschites*	590
nautilus Schneider, 1784	*Octopodia nautilus*	590
polypus Schneider, 1784	*Octopodia polypus*	590
praecox Grassi & Feletti, 1890 (as applied to a human malaria parasite)	*Haemamoeba praecox*	622
primaevus Volger, 1860	*Teleosteus primaevus*	430
quartanae Celli & Sanfelice, 1891	*Plasmodium malariae quartanae*	622
quartanae Kruse, 1892	*Plasmodium malariae quartanae*	622
quartanae Lewkowicz, 1897	*Haemosporidium quartanae*	622
quotidianae Celli & Sanfelice, 1891	*Plasmodium malariae quotidianae*	622
scalaris Linnaeus, 1768	*Graptolithus scalaris*	377
sepia Schneider, 1784	*Octopodia sepia*	590
sexdecimanae Lewkowicz, 1897	*Haemosporidium sexdecimanae*	622
tertianae Celli & Sanfelice, 1891	*Plasmodium malariae tertianae*	623
tertianae Kruse, 1892	*Plasmodium malariae tertianae*	623
tertianae Lewkowicz, 1897	*Haemosporidium tertianae*	623
teuthis Schneider, 1784	*Octopodia teuthis*	590
tropica Kock, 1899	*Plasmodium tropica*	623
undecimanae Lewkowicz, 1897	*Haemosporidium undecimanae*	623
vigesimotertianae Lewkowicz, 1897	*Haemosporidium vigesimotertianae*	623

(*Note.*—Under the decision by which the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology was established, every generic name which has been, or in the future is, rejected or declared to be invalid is automatically to be placed on the " Index ". In addition ,therefore, to the names cited in the foregoing list, certain trivial names rejected earlier during the Paris Session and also all the trivial names rejected in *Opinions* published prior to that Session were also placed on the " Official Index " under the foregoing decision taken during the Paris Session.)

"Official List of Generic Names in Zoology": *Pag*

scope and purpose of 267–268, 271

status of a name placed on 268

gender of each name placed on, to be specified in *Opinion* concerned and recorded in appropriate Schedule to *Règles* 341

duties of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in relation to maintenance and development of defined, and to be specified in By-Laws 269

two or more names of allied genera to be placed on, where specialists are agreed that such stabilisation is desirable but are not agreed as to the taxonomic limits of the genera concerned 237, 268

to be included in a Schedule to *Règles* 334

"Official List of Generic Names in Zoology", confirmation, subject, in some cases, to modifications, of certain entries in, made under *Opinions* published prior to the Paris Session :—

Cercopithecus Linnaeus, 1758 (*Opinion* 104), name validated under the plenary powers and type species similarly designated 311

Echeneis Linnaeus, 1758 (*Opinion* 92), erroneous entry relating to type species validated under the plenary powers 538—539

Euploea Fabricius, 1807 (*Opinion* 163) validated as against *Euploea* [Illiger], 1807, under the plenary powers 457

Helicopis Fabricius, 1807 (*Opinion* 137), validated as against *Helicopis* [Illiger], 1807, under the plenary powers 457

Laverania Feletti & Grassi, 1889 (*Opinion* 104) erroneous entry cancelled and revised entry under the plenary powers substituted therefor 612, 619

Limulus Müller, 1785 (*Opinion* 104), a synonym of *Xiphosura* Brünnich, 1771 : Secretary to the Commission to submit Report on question of using plenary powers to validate existing entry 311–312

Mabuya Fitzinger, 1826 (*Opinion* 92), erroneous entry regarding type species of, corrected 356

Nabis Latreille [1802–1803] (*Opinion* 104), position secured through the suppression of *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796, under the plenary powers 467

Necator Stiles, 1903 (*Opinion* 66), validated under the plenary powers by suppression of *Necator* Sclater & Saunders, 1896 301

Nymphidium Fabricius, 1807 (*Opinion* 171), validated as against *Nymphidium* [Illiger], 1807, under the plenary powers 458

Plasmodium Marchiafava & Celli, 1885 (*Opinion* 104) erroneous entry cancelled and revised entry under the plenary powers substituted therefor 612, 619

Podura Linnaeus, 1758 (*Opinion* 104), type species of, varied under the plenary powers 506–507

Pontia Fabricius, 1807 (*Opinion* 137), validated as against *Pontia* [Illiger], 1807, under the plenary powers 458

Schistosoma Weinland, 1858 (*Opinion* 77), validated under the plenary powers 322–323

Taenia Linnaeus, 1758 (*Opinion* 84), validation, under the plenary powers, of entry relating to type species of 585–586

Page

"Official List of Generic Names in Zoology," names placed on, during Paris Session:

Actinote Hübner, [1819] .. 394
Agriades Hübner, [1819] .. 484
Alca Linnaeus, 1758 .. 581
Alydus Fabricius, 1803 .. 467
Amplypterus Hübner, [1819] .. 509
Apatura Fabricius, 1807 .. 457
Aplysia Linnaeus, 1767 .. 303
Aquarius Schellenberg, 1800 .. 473, 474
Arachnoides Leske, 1778 .. 534
Aspidoproctus Newstead, [April] 1901 .. 381
Aulocera Butler, 1867 .. 494
Bellocoris Hahn, 1834 .. 473, 474
Belone Cuvier, 1817 .. 428
Beosus Amyot & Serville, 1843 .. 474
Bombus Latreille, 1802 .. 406
Brassolis Fabricius, 1807 .. 457
Brissus Gray, 1825 .. 527
Bulla Linnaeus, 1758 .. 305
Calliphora Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 .. 356
Camponotus Mayr, 1861 .. 410
Carabus Linnaeus, 1758 .. 446
Carcharodus Hübner, [1819] .. 484
Castnia Fabricius, 1807 .. 457
Catoplatus Spinola, 1837 .. 474
Chrysopa Leach, 1815 .. 396
Consul Hübner, [1807] .. 494
Corixa Geoffroy, 1762 .. 370
Danaus Kluk, 1802 .. 494
Diadema Gray, 1825 .. 384
Dictyonota Curtis, 1827 .. 474
Diplodinium Schuberg, 1888 .. 380
Echinarachnius Gray, 1825 .. 534
Echinocardium Gray, 1825 .. 527

Page

"Official List of Generic Names in Zoology", names placed on, during Paris Session (*continued*).

Echinocyamus van Phelsum, 1774 .. 519
Echinodiscus Leske, 1778 .. 535
Eledone Leach, 1817 .. 589
Emesis Fabricius, 1807 .. 457
Equus Linnaeus, 1758 .. 581
Erycina Lamarck, 1805 .. 418
Euchloë Hübner, [1819] .. 484
Euphydryas Scudder, 1872 .. 494
Fibularia Lamarck, 1816 .. 519
Formica Linnaeus, 1758 .. 409
Gastrodes Westwood, 1840 .. 473
Hemerobius Linnaeus, 1758 .. 396
Hygrobia (emend. of *Hygriobia*) Latreille, 1804 .. 460
Limenitis Fabricius, 1807 .. 494
Lycaeides Hübner, [1819] .. 484
Mechanitis Fabricius, 1807 .. 457
Megachile Latreille, 1802 .. 413
Moira Agassiz (A.), 1872 .. 528
Monograptus (emend. of *Monograpsus*) Geinitz, 1852 .. 378
Neptis Fabricius, 1807 .. 457
Nymphalis Kluk, 1802 .. 495
Octopus, Cuvier, [1797] .. 589
Oncotylus Fieber, 1858 .. 474
Ova Gray, 1825 .. 528
Oxycanus Walker, 1856 .. 357
Pachylops Fieber, 1858 .. 474
Palaeoneilo (emend. of *Palaeaneilo*) Hall, 1869 .. 400
Papilio Linnaeus, 1758 .. 495
Phlebotomus (emend. of *Flebotomus*) Rondani, 1840 .. 359
Phyllacanthus Brandt, 1835 .. 521
Pieris Schrank, 1801 .. 495
Pilophorus Hahn, 1826 .. 474
Plebejus Kluk, 1802 .. 495

Page

"Official List of Generic Names in Zoology", names placed on, during Paris Session (*continued*).

Polyommatus Latreille, 1804 .. 484
Pseudoschwagerina Dunbar & Skinner, 1935 .. 464
Psolos (emend. of *Psoidos* and *Psodos*) Treitschke, 1825 .. 231
Pyrgus Hübner, [1819] .. 495
Raphistoma Hall, 1847 .. 428
Remora Gill, 1862 .. 539
Retiolites Barrande, 1850 .. 379
Rhipidophyllum Sandberger, 1889 .. 430
Salda Fabricius, 1803 .. 469
Schizaster Agassiz (L.), [1836] .. 528
Schwagerina von Möller, 1877 .. 464
Spatangus Gray, 1825 .. 528
Strongylocentrotus Brandt, 1835 .. 521
Tethys Linnaeus, 1767 .. 303
Tetyra Fabricius, 1803 .. 474
Tomoceraos Nicolet, 1842 .. 507
Tonna Brünnich, 1771 .. 310
Tremataspis Schmidt, 1866 .. 435
Urania Fabricius, 1807 .. 457
Venus Linnaeus, 1758 .. 304

(*Note.*—Under a decision taken during the Paris Session, every generic name which has formed, or in future forms, the subject of a decision by the Commission is automatically to be placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" or, as the case may be, the "Official Index of Rejected or Invalid Generic Names in Zoology", save in cases where it has been, or is, necessary for the Commission to give a decision on a name which is an available name but is not accepted by specialists as being required for taxonomic purposes (i.e., a name which is treated as a subjective synonym of some older and available name). In consequence of the foregoing decision, a number of names dealt with in *Opinions* published prior to the Paris Session were also placed on the "Official List" at that Session, in addition to those specified in the list of names given here.

"Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" (at first proposed to be styled "Official List of Specific Names in Zoology")

establishment of, and scope and purpose of .. 270–271, 283–284, 627–62
status of a name placed on .. 270
duties of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in relation to maintenance and development of defined, and to be specified in the By-Laws .. 271

"Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" (at first proposed to be styled "Official List of Specific Names in Zoology") (*continued*).

Page

two or more names of nominal species to be placed on, where specialists are agreed that stabilisation of the name of a given taxonomic unit is desirable but are not agreed as to whether that taxonomic unit should be regarded as a distinct species or as a subspecies of a second nominal species 627

trivial names of subspecies eligible for admission to. 627

to be included in a Schedule to the *Règles* 333–334

"Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology", names placed on, during Paris Session.

Trivial name placed on "Official List" (1)	*Combination in which trivial name in Col.* (1) *originally published* (2)	
abietum Bergroth, 1914	*Gastrodes abietum*	473
aceris Esper, [1783]	*Papilio aceris*	458
alceae Esper, [1780]	*Papilio alceae*	485
ampulla Linnaeus, 1758	*Bulla ampulla*	305
antillarum Kirkaldy, 1909	*Cimex antillarum*	474
aquatica Linnaeus, 1758	*Podura aquatica*	507
argus Linnaeus, 1758	*Papilio argus*	480
argyrognomon Bergstrasser, [1779]	*Papilio argyrognomon*	480
aristolochiae Fabricius, 1775	*Papilio aristolochiae*	545
ascanius Cramer, [1775]	*Papilio ascanius*	545
atropos Lamarck, 1816	*Spatangus atropos*	528
australis Walker, 1856	*Oxycanus australis*	357
austriacus Schrank, 1776	*Cimex austriacus*	473, 474
belone Linnaeus, 1761	*Esox belone*	428
bicolor Douglas & Scott, 1868	*Litosoma bicolor*	474
bisperforatus Leske, 1778	*Echinodiscus bisperforatus*	535
brahminus Blanchard, 1844	*Satyrus brahminus*	496
brassicae Linnaeus, 1758	*Papilio brassicae*	496
calcaratus Linnaeus, 1758	*Cimex calcaratus*	467
canaliferus Lamarck, 1817	*Spatangus canaliferus*	528
caricae Linnaeus, 1758	*Papilio caricae*	458
centuncularis Linnaeus, 1758	*Apis centuncularis*	413
cereus Linnaeus, 1767	*Papilio cereus*	458
ciliaris Philippi, 1837	*Asterias ciliaris*	513
clavatus Linnaeus, 1767	*Cimex clavatus*	474

"Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" (at first proposed to be styled "Official List of Specific Names in Zoology") (*continued*).

Trivial name placed on "Official List" (1)	*Combination in which trivial name in Col.* (1) *originally published* (2)	*Page*
constricta Conrad, 1842	*Nuculites constricta*	400
cordatus Sowerby, 1813	*Ammonites cordatus*	393
cordatus Pennant, 1777	*Echinus cordatus*	528
corus Fabricius, 1793	*Papilio corus*	457, 458
creusa Doubleday, [1847]	*Anthocharis creusa*	485
cupido Linnaeus, 1758	*Papilio cupido*	457, 458
daplidice Linnaeus, 1758	*Papilio daplidice*	458
dentatum Stein, 1858	*Entodinium dentatum*	380
depilans Gmelin, 1791	*Aplysia depilans*	303
diana Linnaeus, 1758	*Simia diana*	311
drøbachiensis Müller (O.F.), 1776	*Echinus drøbachiensis*	522
dubius Brandt, 1835	*Cidarites* (*Phyllacanthus*) *dubius*	522
esperi Kirby, 1871	*Euchloë ausonia* Hübner var. *esperi*	486
fabius Cramer, [1776]	*Papilio fabius*	496
fabricii Stål, 1868	*Tingis fabricii*	474
falciparum Welch, 1897	*Haematozoon falciparum*	620
feisthameli Duponchel, 1832	*Papilio feisthameli*	499
fimbria Linnaeus, 1767	*Tethys fimbria*	303
galea Linnaeus, 1758	*Buccinum galea*	310
geinitzianus Barrande, 1850	*Gladiolites geinitzianus*	379
glandon Prunner, 1798	*Papilio glandon*	486
granulatus Linnaeus, 1758	*Carabus granulatus*	446
humulinus Linnaeus, 1758	*Hemerobius humulinus*	397
hylas Linnaeus, 1758	*Papilio hylas*	458
idas Linnaeus, 1761	*Papilio idas*	480
ilia [Schiffermüller & Denis], 1775	*Papilio ilia*	542
iris Linnaeus, 1758	*Papilio iris*	458
ligniperda Latreille, 1802	*Formica ligniperda*	410
littoralis Linnaeus, 1758	*Cimex littoralis*	469
mabouya Lacépède, 1788	*Lacertus mabouya*	356
machaon Linnaeus, 1758	*Papilio machaon*	496

"Official List of Specific, Trivial Names in Zoology" (at first proposed to be styled "Official List of Specific Names in Zoology") (*continued*).

Trivial name placed on "Official List" (1)	*Combination in which trivial name in Col.* (1) *originally published* (2)	*Page*
malvae Linnaeus, 1758	*Papilio malvae*	496
maritimus Scopoli, 1763	*Cimex maritimus*	474
minor Lubbock, 1862	*Macrotoma minor*	507
moelleri Rauser-Chernoussova, 1937	*Schwagerina moelleri*	464
moschatus Lamarck, 1798	*Octopus moschatus*	590
najas De Geer, 1773	*Cimex najas*	473, 474
naucrates (emend. of *neucrates*)	*Echeneis neucrates*	539
novaezealandiae Owen, 1843	*Dinornis novaezealandiae*	450
orientalis Bremer, 1864	*Anthocharis belemida* Hübner var. *orientalis*	486
ovata Rudolphi, 1803	*Fasciola ovata*	387
ovulum Lamarck, 1816	*Fibularia ovulum*	519
panopus Cramer, [1779]	*Sphinx panopus*	509
papatasi Scopoli, 1786	*Bibio papatasi*	359
papyraceus Sowerby, 1822	*Pecten papyraceus*	436
parma Lamarck, 1816	*Scutella parma*	535
pecten Linnaeus, 1758	*Anomia pecten*	436
pellucida Lamarck, 1805	*Erycina pellucida*	418
perla Linnaeus, 1758	*Hemerobius perla*	397
pertinax Newstead, 1901	*Walkeriana pertinax*	382
phaeton Drury, [1773]	*Papilio phaeton*	496
placenta Linnaeus, 1758	*Echinus placenta*	535
plexippus Linnaeus, 1758	*Papilio plexippus*	361
podalirius Linnaeus, 1758	*Papilio podalirius*	499
polychloros Linnaeus, 1758	*Papilio polychloros*	496
polymnia Linnaeus, 1758	*Papilio polymnia*	458
populi Linnaeus, 1758	*Papilio populi*	496
princeps Ehrenberg, 1842	*Borealis princeps*	464
priodon Bronn, 1834	*Lomatoceras priodon*	378
punctipes Reuter, 1873	*Oncotylus punctipes*	474
pusillus Müller (O.F.), 1776	*Echinocyamus pusillus*	519
purpureus Müller (O.F.), 1776	*Spatagus purpureus*	528

"Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" (at first proposed to be styled "Official List of Specific Names in Zoology") (*continued*).

Trivial name placed on "Official List" (1)	*Combination in which trivial name in Col.* (1) *originally published* (2)	*Page*
remora Linnaeus, 1758	*Echeneis remora*	539
rufa Linnaeus, 1758	*Formica rufa*	410
schmidti Rohon, 1892	*Tremataspis schmidti*	435
setosa Leske, 1778	*Echinometra setosa*	385
solium Linnaeus, 1758	*Taenia solium*	586
sophorae Linnaeus, 1758	*Papilio sophorae*	458
striatus Emmons, 1842	*Maclurea striatus*	428
strichnocera Fieber, 1844	*Dictyonota strichnocera*	474
struthoides Owen, 1844	*Dinornis struthoides*	450
studeri Agassiz (L.), 1840	*Schizaster studeri*	528
tardus Herbst, 1779	*Dytiscus tardus*	461
terrestris Linnaeus, 1758	*Apis terrestris*	407
thalia Linnaeus, 1758	*Papilio thalia*	395
uddeni Beede & Kniker, 1924	*Schwagerina uddeni*	464
unicolor Leske, 1778	*Spatangus brissus* var. *unicolor*	529
verrucosa Linnaeus, 1758	*Venus verrucosa*	305
vivax Grassi & Feletti, 1890	*Haemamoeba vivax*	620
vomitoria Linnaeus, 1758	*Musca vomitoria*	356
vulgaris Cuvier, [1797]	*Octopus vulgaris*	590
vulgare Sandberger, 1889	*Rhipidophyllum vulgare*	430
vulgaris Schmeil, 1897	*Diaptomus vulgaris*	377

(*NOTE.*—Under a decision taken during the Paris Session, every trivial name which has formed, or in future forms, the subject of a decision by the Commission is automatically to be added either to the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" or, as the case may be, on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology", save in cases where it has been, or is in future, necessary for the Commission to give a decision on a name which is an available name but which is not accepted by specialists as being required for taxonomic purposes (i.e. a name which is treated as a subjective synonym of some older and available name). In consequence, a number of names dealt with in *Opinions* published prior to the Paris Session and also certain names dealt with at the Paris Session prior to the decision to establish the above "Official List" were also placed on that "List" at the Paris Session in addition to the names specified above.)

Page

Oken, 1816; *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte*, assistance of specialists to be sought on question of existing practice in regard to, and decision taken on status of, as soon as possible thereafter 366

Oncotylus Fieber, 1858, *Oncotylus punctipes* Reuter, 1873, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of; placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 474

Ophonus Stephens, 1827, application for the designation, under the plenary powers, of *Carabus obscurus* Fabricius, 1792, as type species of, deferred for further information to be obtained 446, 447

Opinions and *Declarations* of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature: recommendations and reports regarding.

Opinions and *Declarations* published since 1935, Report on 27

incorporation in the *Règles*, in whole or in part, of interpretations of individual provisions given in *Opinions* already rendered 66–67, 132–137

Opinions to be repealed for interpretative purposes when interpretation contained therein incorporated in the *Règles* 135–136

invitation to zoologists to notify to Commission particulars of any apparent new interpretation contained in any *Opinion* not repealed by the Paris Congress consequent upon present codification of interpretations given in *Opinions* so far published 136

Opinions rendered after the Paris Congress to deal only with individual nomenclatorial problems, questions relating to the interpretation and amendment of the *Règles* being dealt with in *Declarations* only 136–137

Opinions and *Declarations* rendered after the Paris Congress, decisions in, to be looked for only in the "summary"; *Declarations* relating to the interpretation of the *Règles* published in an inter-Congress period to be reported to the next meeting of the Congress for the inclusion in the *Règles* of the interpretations so given, the *Declarations* in question thereupon to be repealed for interpretative purposes; incorporation in the By-Laws of the Commission of provisions relating to the method to be followed in future in the adoption of *Declarations* and of the reporting of *Declarations* to the Congress 137

Opinions containing erroneous interpretations of the *Règles* or interpretations which, though correct when the *Opinion* in question was adopted, have ceased to be so, consequent upon an amendment of the *Règles*, to be cancelled forthwith 135

certain *Opinions* already rendered to be cancelled, in whole or in part, except for historical purposes, owing to the decisions recorded therein either being incorrect or having lost all practical significance by reason of their transitory character.. ..335–337

decisions on nomenclatorial problems given in *Opinions* to be recorded in Schedules attached to the *Règles*, the *Opinions* concerned being thereupon cancelled for all except historical purposes 65, 261, 332, 333

clarification and amendment of certain *Opinions* prior to the decisions recorded therein being recorded in Schedules to the *Règles* 337–338

Secretary to be requested to transfer to Schedules to the *Règles* decisions on individual nomenclatorial problems given in *Opinions* already rendered or agreed upon at the Paris Session, any cases of apparent errors so detected to be reported to the Commission for any necessary correction 340–341

Page

Opinions and *Declarations* of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : recommendations and reports regarding (*continued*).

Secretary to examine and complete bibliographical and similar references to individual names and books cited in relation to all decisions regarding individual nomenclatorial problems prior to the transfer thereof to Schedules to the *Règles* 340

Secretary to ensure that, in the case of every trivial name entered in a Schedule to the *Règles*, there is cited in connection therewith the generic name in combination with which the trivial name in question was originally published 340

Opinions rendered dealing with part only of question submitted for decision to be completed as soon as possible ; practice of issuing *Opinions* dealing with part only of problem submitted condemned ; Secretary to examine *Opinions* already rendered with a view to submitting proposals for filling any gaps so detected 355

practice of delaying decisions on individual nomenclatorial problems involving controversial, though not necessarily difficult, issues condemned as calculated to impair authority and prestige of Commission ; decisions on individual nomenclatorial problems involving controversial, though not necessarily difficult issues, in future, to be given promptly and without fear or favour 363

Opinions 1–16, reissues of, examination of " Editorial Notes " and footnotes attached to 560–562

Opinions 1–133 ; facsimile edition to be issued as soon as possible 591–594

Opinions, method of recording decisions taken in 632–640

Opinions rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature prior to Paris Congress, recommendations regarding.

Opinion 1, ruling in, relating to the meaning of the expression " indication " as applied to a generic name cancelled and revised definition agreed upon 78–80

remainder of, clarified and incorporated in the *Règles* 148–149

repeal of 166

Opinion 2 (status of a name based on a hypothetical form), incorporated in the *Règles* 144

repeal of 166

Opinion 3 (priority to be assigned to Linnaeus, 1758, *Systema Naturae*, 10th edition), incorporated in the *Règles* 150–151

repeal of 166

Opinion 4 (status of names which, prior to publication, were manuscript names and of names which, prior to valid publication, had been published as *nomina nuda*), clarified and incorporated in the *Règles* 145–146

repeal of 166

Opinion 5 (status of names published prior to 1758 and later republished), incorporated in the *Règles* 150

repeal of 166

Opinion 6 (type species of a genus published prior to 1st January 1931 with two included species only and no designated or indicated type species, where later one of those species becomes the type species of a monotypical genus), clarified and incorporated in the *Règles* 157

repeal of 166

Page

Opinions rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature prior to the Paris Congress: recommendations regarding (*continued*).

Opinion 7 (significance of the expression " n.g., n.sp." as used on the publication of a generic name prior to 1st January 1931), clarified and incorporated in the *Règles* 152–153

repeal of 166

Opinion 8 (trivial names based on modern patronymics), cancellation of, because incorrect 68

Opinion 9, cancelled because no effective decision given therein 335

Opinion 10 (type species of genera established with identical limits), incorporated in the *Règles* 156

repeal of 166

Opinion 13 (trivial name of Sand Crab) cancelled and to be replaced by amended *Opinions* on the matters dealt with therein 573–580

Opinion 14 (author selecting a type species of a genus published without a designated or indicated type species to be assumed to have identified correctly the species so selected) incorporated in the *Règles* 157–158

repeal of, for interpretative purposes 166

Opinion 15 (meaning of expression " divulgué dans une publication ") amended, clarified and incorporated in the *Règles* 165, 216, 217–222

repeal of, for interpretative purposes 221

Opinion 16 (interpretation of Rule (d) (absolute tautonymy) in Article 30 in relation to univerbal pre-1758 specific names cited in the synomymy of a species included after 1757 in a genus having the same word as its generic name), clarified and incorporated in the *Règles* 154–155

status of certain generic names cited in, to be determined as soon as possible 580–583

repeal of, for interpretative purposes 166

Opinion 18 (interpretation of Rule (d) in Article 30 in cases where a tautonymous trivial name of a synonym is not cited when a generic name is first published), incorporated in the *Règles* 153–154

repeal of, for interpretative purposes 166

Opinion 20 (meaning of the expression " nomenclature binaire "), cancelled because incorrect 66

Opinion 23 (*Aspro* versus *Cheilodipterus*), cancelled because incorrect 335

Opinion 24 (*Antennarius* versus *Histrio*), summary amended 66

cancelled because incorrect 335

Opinion 25 (generic names differing only by terminations " -ella " and " -iella "), not to be incorporated in *Règles*, in view of decision that list of differences given in Article 34 which are to be ignored for the purposes of homonyny is to be an exhaustive list 162

repeal of, for interpretative purposes 166

Opinion 26 (interpretation of Article 19 on the emendation of names) clarified and incorporated, in part, in the *Règles* 141–142

repeal of, for interpretative purposes 166

Page

Opinions rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature prior to the Paris Congress: recommendations regarding (*continued*).

Opinion 27 (emendation of names based on modern patronymics), incorporated in the *Règles* 142

repeal of, for interpretative purposes 166

Opinion 29 (emendation of names), decision in, not incorporated in the *Règles* 141

repeal of, for interpretative purposes 166

Opinion 31 (type species of *Columbina*), correction of error in 337

Opinion 32 (type species of *Sphex*), cancelled because superseded by use of the plenary powers 335

Opinion 35 (species eligible for selection as the type species of substitute genera), amended and incorporated in the *Règles*, in relation to Rules (f) and (g) in Article 30 .. 66, 155–156

repeal of 166

Opinion 36 (emendation of names erroneously transcribed from Greek words), incorporated in the *Règles* 142–143

repeal of, for interpretative purposes 166

Opinion 37 (status of names in Brisson, 1760, *Ornithologia*), cancelled because incorrect but decision in, validated under the plenary powers 65–66

Opinion 41 (emendation of a name wrongly transliterated from the Greek), incorporated in the *Règles* 143

repeal of, for interpretative purposes 166

Opinion 43 (status of generic and specific names described jointly), clarified and incorporated in the *Règles* 149

repeal of, for interpretative purposes 166

Opinion 44 (*Leptocephalus* and *Conger*), cancelled because superseded by *Opinion* 89 ... 335

Opinion 46 (type species of a genus established without any nominal species referred thereto), amended, clarified and incorporated in the *Règles* 159–160, 346

repeal of 166

Opinion 47 (type species of a genus for which one species only was cited by its author), incorporated in the *Règles* 153

repeal of, for interpretative purposes 166

Opinion 49 (status of a name given conditionally), incorporated in the *Règles* .. 144–145

repeal of, for interpretative purposes 166

Opinion 51 (meaning of the expression "divulgué dans une publication"), amended, clarified and incorporated in the *Règles* 165, 216, 217–221

repeal of, for interpretative purposes 221

Opinion 52 (significance to be attached to the citation of a type locality), incorporated in the *Règles* 150

repeal of, for interpretative purposes 166

Page

Opinions rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature prior to the Paris Congress: recommendations regarding (*continued*).

Opinion 59 (status of names appearing in advance separates), incorporated in the *Règles* 146

  repeal of, for interpretative purposes .. 166

Opinion 60 (emendation of trivial names consisting of incorrectly formed adjectives) .. 144

  repeal of, for interpretative purposes .. 166

Opinion 61 (emendation of names), decision in, not incorporated in the *Règles* .. 141

  repeal of, for interpretative purposes .. 166

Opinion 62 (eligibility of a species to be the type species of more than one genus), incorporated in the *Règles* .. 156

  repeal of .. 166

Opinion 63 (emendation of trivial names incorrectly formed from the name of a type locality), incorporated in the *Règles* .. 143

  repeal of, for interpretative purposes .. 166

Opinion 64 (eligibility of single letters as trivial names), incorporated in the *Règles* .. 140

  repeal of .. 166

Opinion 65 (author of a genus to be assumed to have correctly identified the species referred by him thereto), dealt with in conjunction with *Opinion* 168.. .. 158

  repeal of .. 166

Opinion 66 (erroneous entry in, in relation to the generic name *Necator*), error corrected 300–301

Opinion 68 (type species of *Pleuronectes*), decision in, to be completed as soon as possible; 337

Opinion 69 (type species of *Sparus*), decision in, to be completed as soon as possible .. 337

Opinion 74 (Apstein's list of "Nomina Conservanda") cancelled because decision in, of no current significance .. 336

Opinion 76 (*Pyrosoma* versus *Monophora*, etc.) part only of contents to be incorporated in the *Règles* .. 336

Opinion 77 (erroneous entry in, in relation to the generic name *Schistosoma*), error validated under the plenary powers .. 319–323

Opinion 78 (trivial name of Rocky Mountain Fever Tick), decision in, to be re-examined and in meantime this matter to be treated as *sub judice* .. 338

Opinion 82 (type species of *Calliphora*), decision in, to be completed as soon as possible 355–356

Opinion 83 (specific homonymy), cancelled because subject dealt with more completely in comprehensive revision of Articles 35 and 36 recommended to Congress .. 336

Opinion 84 (addition of certain names to the "Official List") erroneous entry relating to type species of *Taenia* Linnaeus, 1758, validated under the plenary powers .. 584–586

Opinion 87 (status of names appearing in proof sheets), incorporated in the *Règles* .. 146

  repeal of .. 166

Opinion 88 (status of a generic name based upon a composite nominal species), clarified and incorporated in the *Règles* .. 151–152

Page

Opinions rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature prior to the Paris Congress: recommendations regarding (*continued*).

repeal of, for interpretative purposes .. 166

procedure on incorporation in the *Règles* of decision in relation to an individual name 336

Opinion 92 (addition of certain names to the "Official List") erroneous entry relating to type species of *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, validated under the plenary powers 538–539

erroneous entry relating to type species of *Mabuya* Fitzinger, 1826, corrected .. 356

Opinion 97 (Hübner's *Tentamen*) clarification of decision in, prior to incorporation in Schedule to the *Règles* .. 338

Opinion 99 (*Endamoeba* and *Entamoeba*) decision in, to be re-examined and in meantime matter to be treated as *sub judice* .. 338

Opinion 102 (generic names not invalidated by homonymy with names of Orders and higher categories), incorporated in the *Règles* .. 164–165

repeal of, for interpretative purposes .. 166

decision regarding an individual name included in, not to be incorporated in a Schedule to the *Règles* .. 336

Opinion 104 (addition of certain names to the "Official List"): erroneous entry in, in relation to the generic name *Cercopithecus* validated under the plenary powers 310–311

erroneous entries, in relation to the generic names *Laverania* and *Plasmodium*, cancelled and corrected and amplified particulars added under the plenary powers .. 612

Limulus placed on the "Official List" in, a synonym of *Xiphosura* Brünnich, 1771, question of action to be taken to be considered .. 311–312

Nabis Latreille, [1802–1803], position of, on "Official List" confirmed .. 467

Podura Linnaeus, 1758, type species varied under the plenary powers .. 506

Opinion 107 (*Echinocyamus pusillus*), part of decision in, to be incorporated in Schedule to the *Règles* .. 337

Opinion 113 (*Sarcoptes*) erroneous date cited in, to be corrected .. 337

Opinion 116 ("*-nus*" and "*-mus*" names), repeal of, for interpretative purposes .. 349

Opinion 124 (status of terms intermediate between generic and specific trivial names used by Linnaeus in the 10th Edition of the *Systema Naturae*), extension of decision in, to other works by Linnaeus and to works by Fabricius (J.C.) .. 266–267

decision in, extended to cover intermediate terms used by Hübner (J.) in the legends to the plates of the first volume of the *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* and in the *Systematisch-alphabetisches Verzeichniss* .. 289–290

Opinion 125 (status of emended names), dealt with in conjunction with *Opinion* 148 .. 163

repeal of, for interpretative purposes .. 166

Opinion 126 (d'Orbigny's *Prodrome*), decision regarding status of names in, confirmed, and deletion from *Opinion*, of misleading references to neotypes .. 296–297

Opinion 129 (suppression of *Bipinnaria* and certain other names published by Sars), names, though suppressed for purposes of Article 25, to retain status for purposes of Article 34 .. 338–339

Page

Opinions rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature prior to the Paris Congress: recommendations regarding (*continued*).

Opinion 133 (family names), repeal of, because superseded by *Opinion* 141 336

Opinion 138 (meaning of expression "definite bibliographic reference"), cancelled on repeal of relevant portion of Article 25 70

Opinion 141 (family names), incorporated in the *Règles*, partly as mandatory provisions and partly as *Recommandations* 138–139

repeal of 166

Opinion 145 (status of a name previously published in a work rejected for nomenclatorial purposes) 165

repeal of 166

Opinion 147 (grounds on which a generic name is to be rejected as a homonym), amended and incorporated in the *Règles* 161–162

repeal of 166

Opinion 148 (status of a generic name published as an invalid emendation of an earlier name), amended, amplified and incorporated in the *Règles* 147–148

status of emendations in relation to generic homonymy, decision incorporated in the *Règles* 163

paragraph (3) of summary of, not to be incorporated in the *Règles* 164

repeal of 166

Opinion 164 (type species of a genus not liable to change when one genus is united with another on taxonomic grounds), incorporated in the *Règles* 157

repeal of 166

Opinion 168 (author of a genus to be assumed to have correctly identified the species referred by him thereto), amplified and incorporated in the *Règles* 158–159

repeal of 166

Opinion 172 (significance to be attached to the selection in a literature-recording serial of the type species of a genus, the name of which was published prior to 1st January, 1931), incorporated in the *Règles* 161

repeal of 166

Opinion 183 (need for generic names to be published in the nominative singular), incorporated in the *Règles*.. 139–140

repeal of 166

Opinion 190 (*Rhynchonella alta*), dealt with in conjunction with *Opinion* 191 .. 146–147

Opinion 191 (a special aspect of the problem of "publication"), incorporated in the *Règles* 146–147

repeal of 166

Page

Opinions to be rendered embodying decisions on the under-mentioned matters taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the Paris Congress:

Psoidos Treitschke, 1825, and *Psodos* Treitschke, 1827 emendation of, to *Psolos* under Article 19 .. 231

status of terms intermediate between generic and specific trivial name employed by Linnaeus in works other than 10th edition of *Systema Naturae* (completion of *Opinion* 124) .. 266–267

status of terms intermediate between generic and specific trivial names employed by Fabricius (J. C.) (extension of *Opinion* 124) .. 267

status of terms intermediate between generic and specific trivial names employed by Hübner (J.) (i) in volume 1 of the *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* and (ii) in the *Systematisch-alphabetisches Verzeichniss* (extension of *Opinion* 124) .. 290

Necator Stiles, 1903, correction of error in *Opinion* 66 relating to placing of, on "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" .. 301

Aplysia Linnaeus, 1767, and *Tethys* Linnaeus, 1767, validation of, under the plenary powers and matters incidental thereto .. 304

Venus Linnaeus, 1758, type species of, designated under the plenary powers .. 305

Bulla Linnaeus, 1758, type species of, designated under the plenary powers .. 305

Brünnich, 1771, *Zoologiae Fundamenta*, status of generic names published in .. 309

Tonna Brünnich, 1771, placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" .. 310

Cercopithecus validated under the plenary powers as from Linnaeus 1758 (validation of an error in *Opinion* 104) .. 311

Schistosoma Weinland, 1858, validated under the plenary powers (correction of an error in *Opinion* 77) .. 323

Calliphora Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830, placed on "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" (completion of *Opinion* 82) .. 356

Mabuya Fitzinger, 1826, correction of erroneous entry in "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" relating to type species of, (correction of *Opinion* 92) .. 356

Porina Walker, 1856, placed on "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" and *Oxycanus* Walker, 1856, on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" .. 357–358

Flebotomus Rondani, 1840, emendation of, under the plenary powers, to *Phlebotomus* .. 359

trivial name *plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio plexippus*), determination, under plenary powers, of application of .. 361

Geoffroy (E. L.), 1762, *Hist. abrég. Ins. Env. Paris*, status of new names published in .. 369

Corixa Geoffroy, 1762, use of plenary powers for .. 370

"Buprestidae", an anonymous pamphlet by F. W. Hope, distributed in 1836, status of new names in .. 371

Koch (C. L.), 1835–1842, *Deutschl. Crust. Myriapod. u. Arachn.*, species eligible for selection as type species of genera established in .. 375

trivial name *vulgaris* Schmeil, 1897 (as published in the binominal combination *Diaptomus vulgaris*) validated under the plenary powers .. 377

Graptolithus Linnaeus, 1768, and *scalaris* Linnaeus, 1768 (as published in the binominal combination *Graptolithus scalaris*) suppressed under the plenary powers .. 377

Page

Opinions to be rendered embodying decisions on the undermentioned matters taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the Paris Congress (*continued*).

Monograptus (emend. of *Monograpsus*) Geinitz, 1852, validation of, under the plenary powers and matters incidental thereto .. 378

Retiolites Barrande, 1850, validation of, under the plenary powers .. 379

Diplodinium Schuberg, 1888, type species of .. 381

Aspidoproctus Newstead, 1901, status of .. 382

Phoranthella Townsend, 1915, and *Phoranthella morrisoni* Townsend, 1915, status of .. 383

Diadema Gray, 1820, validation of, under the plenary powers .. 385

Fasciola ovata Rudolphi, 1803, determination of lectotype of .. 387

Ammonites cordatus Sowerby, 1813, designation of lectotype of, under the plenary powers .. 393

Actinote Hübner, [1919], designation of type species of, under the plenary powers .. 395

Hemerobius Linnaeus, 1758, and *Chrysopa* Leach, 1815, designation of type species of, under the plenary powers .. 397

Palaeaneilo Hall, 1869, emendation of, under Article 19, to *Palaeoneilo* .. 400

Pallas (P. S.), *Zoographia rosso-asiatica*, dates of publication of the several volumes of .. 403

Clavellarius Olivier, 1789, suppression of, under the plenary powers .. 404

Bombus Latreille, 1802, use of plenary powers for, in so far as necessary .. 407

Formica Linnaeus, 1758, and *Camponotus* Mayr, 1861, placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " .. 410

Megachile Latreille, 1802, placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " .. 413

Erycina Lamarck, 1805, designation of type species of, under the plenary powers .. 418

Gesner, 1758, *Tractatus physicus*, suppressed for nomenclatorial purposes .. 420

Liodes Heyden, 1826, status of .. 421

Raphistoma Hall, 1847, and *Belone* Cuvier, 1817, validated under the plenary powers .. 428

Teleosteus Volger, 1860, and *Teleosteus primaevus* Volger, 1860, suppression of, under plenary powers and matters incidental thereto .. 430

trivial name *mcfarlandi* Cockerell, 1902 (as published in the binominal combination *Chromodoris mcfarlandi*) to be emended to *macfarlandi* under Article 19 .. 431

annulatum Dschunkowsky & Luhs (as published in the binominal combination *Piroplasma annulatum*), lectotype of, (issue of *Opinion* to be deferred while final effort made to determine date of publication of) .. 433

Tremataspis Schmidt, 1866, designation of type species of, under the plenary powers .. 435

trivial name *pecten* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Anomia pecten*), identity of species to which applicable determined under the plenary powers and matters incidental thereto .. 436

Carabus Linnaeus, 1758, designation of type species of, under the plenary powers .. 446

Dinornis novaezealandiae Owen, 1843, lectotype of, determined .. 450

Page

Opinions to be rendered embodying decisions on the under-mentioned matters taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the Paris Congress (*continued*).

Martin, 1793, *Fig. Descr. Petrif. Derbyshire*, and 1809 *Petrif. Derbiensia*, not available for nomenclatorial purposes 452

certain generic names in Order Lepidoptera published in 1807 almost simultaneously by Illiger and Fabricius, validation, under plenary powers of use by Fabricius 459

Hygriobia Latreille, 1804, emended to *Hygrobia* under Article 19 461

Schwagerina von Möller, 1877, type species of 464

Alydus Fabricius, 1803, validation of, under the plenary powers 467

Salda Fabricius, 1803, designation of type species of, under the plenary powers 469

Gastrodes Westwood, 1840, type species of 473, 474

Aquarius Schellenberg, 1800, type species of 473, 474

Bellocoris Hahn, 1834, type species of; *Beosus* Amyot & Serville, 1843, type species of; *Catoplatus* Spinola, 1837, type species of; *Dictyonota* Curtis, 1827, type species of; *Oncotylus* Fieber, 1858, type species of; *Pachylops* Fieber, 1858, type species of; *Pilophorus* Hahn, 1826, type species of; *Tetyra* Fabricius, 1803, type species of 474

idas Linnaeus, 1761 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio idas*) validated under the plenary powers and species to which applicable similarly determined 480

six generic names in the Order Lepidoptera placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" and three names in the same Order placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" and matters incidental thereto 486

"Hildesheim List, [1839]", suppression of, under the plenary powers 486–488

ten generic names in the Order Lepidoptera (Sub-Order Rhopalocera) corresponding to genera recognised in the invalid "Tentamen" of Hübner placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 496

podalirius Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio podalirius*), determination of species to which applicable, under the plenary powers 499

Meuschen's Index to Gronovius' *Zoophylacium Gronovianum* not available for nomenclatorial purposes 504

Podura Linnaeus, 1758, designation of type species of, under the plenary powers 507

Amplypterus Hübner, [1819], type species of 509

Echinocyamus van Phelsum, 1774, and *Fibularia* Lamarck, 1816, designation of type species of, under the plenary powers 519

Phyllacanthus Brandt, 1835, and *Strongylocentrotus* Brandt, 1835, validation of, under plenary powers, so far as necessary 522

Brissus, Gray, 1825, *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825, *Moira* Agassiz, 1872, *Ova* Gray, 1825, *Schizaster* Agassiz, [1836], *Spatangus* Gray, 1825, use of plenary powers, so far as necessary to validate existing practice, and determination of type species of 529

Arachnoides Leske, 1778, and *Echinarachnius* Gray, 1825, validation of, under the plenary powers, and determination of type species of 535

Echeneis Linnaeus, 1758, designation of type species of, under the plenary powers (validation of an error in *Opinion* 92) and matters incidental thereto 539

Page

Opinions to be rendered embodying decisions on the undermentioned matters taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the Paris Congress (*concluded*).

- *iris* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio iris*), determination of species to which applicable, under the plenary powers 542
- *aristolochiae* Fabricius, 1775 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio aristolochiae*) and *ascanius* Cramer, [1775] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio ascanius*), validated under the plenary powers 545
- Zimmermann (A. E. W. von), 1777, *Specimen Zoologiae*, not available for nomenclatorial purposes, but that author's *Geographische Geschichte* of 1778–1783, an available work 548
- Frisch (J. L.), 1775, *Natur-System der vierfüssigen Thiere*, not available for nomenclatorial purposes 549
- Nozeman & Vosmaer, 1758, *Geslachten der Vogelen* (translation of Moehring, 1752, *Avium Genera*) not available for nomenclatorial purposes 568
- Catesby (M.), *Nat. Hist. Carolina*, status of names in edition published by Edwards (G.) in 1771 (*Opinion* to replace *Opinion* 13, in part) 571
- Meuschen (F. C.), 1778, *Museum Gronovianum*, not available for nomenclatorial purposes 573
- *Alca* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Equus* Linnaeus, 1758, placed on " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " (names dealt with in *Opinion* 16) 581, 583
- *Taenia* Linnaeus, 1758, designation of type species of, under the plenary powers (correction of error in *Opinion* 84) 586
- *Octopodia* Schneider, 1784, suppression of, under the plenary powers ; certain reputed generic names alleged to have been published by Schneider on the same occasion declared to be cheironyms with certain other decisions consequential thereon 588–590
- Human Malaria Parasites, nomenclature of (validation and amplification of entry in *Opinion* 104) 612–624

OPISTHOLEBETIDAE, *see* DISSOTREMATIDAE.

d'Orbigny's " Prodrome ", of 1850, decision in *Opinion* 126 regarding status of names in, confirmed 297

Orders, rules governing nomenclature of, question of introducing, into the *Règles*, to be examined by the Secretary 385–386

Oreas Hübner, [1806], an invalid " Tentamen " name, placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 492, 495

organites and sclerites (fragments of fossil invertebrates), suggested introduction of a system of nomenclature for 274

- expressions included in the suggested new system of nomenclature for, available as technical terms but not to be recognised as names for the purposes of the *Règles* 294

orientalis Bremer, 1864 (as published in the trinominal combination *Anthocharis belemida* Hübner, var. *orientalis*) placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 486

originally included species, determination of identity of, for purposes of Article 30, *see Règles*, etc., Article 30, Rule (f).

Page

Orpheides Hübner, [1819], (type species, by designation under the plenary powers: *Papilio demodocus* Esper, [1798]); placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" .. 484

Orthoceros Brünnich, 1771, Secretary to submit Report on .. 312–313

Oscillaria Laveran, 1881, declared to be invalid .. 614

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" .. 620

Otis Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" to be considered .. 582

Ova Gray, 1825 (type species by monotypy: *Spatangus canaliferus* Lamarck, 1816); placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" .. 528

ovata Rudolphi, 1803 (as published in the binominal combination *Fasciola ovata*), identity of determined by Braun (1901) in accordance with the *Règles*; placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" .. 387

ovulum Lamarck, 1816, *Fibularia*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Fibularia* Lamarck, 1816; placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" .. 519

Oxycanus Walker, 1856 (type species, by selection by Kirby, 1892: *Oxycanus australis* Walker, 1856) placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" .. 357

Ozoena Rafinesque, 1814, declared to be invalid, because a junior homonym of *Ozaena* Olivier, 1812; placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" .. 589

Pachylops Fieber, 1858, *Litosoma bicolor* Douglas & Scott, 1868, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of; placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" .. 474

"page precedence" principle, substitution of, for "first reviser" principle for determining relative priority of names of identical date published in the same book or serial .. 257–258

Report on, submitted by Secretary .. 328–331

Palaeaneilo Hall, 1869, emended to *Palaeoneilo* under Article 19 .. 400

Palaeoneilo (emend. of *Palaeaneilo*) Hall, 1869 (type species by selection by Hall, 1885: *Nuculites constricta* Conrad (T.A.), 1842) placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" .. 400

Pallas (P. S.), *Zoographia rosso-asiatica*, dates of publication of the several volumes of, determined .. 403

Page

panopus Cramer, [1779], *Sphinx*, declared to be the type species of *Amplypterus* Hübner, [1819] by selection by Kirby, 1892 ; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 509

papatasi Scopoli, 1786 (as published in the binominal combination *Bibio papatasi*) placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 359

Papilio Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Latreille, 1810 : *Papilio machaon* Linnaeus, 1758) ; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 495

papyraceus Sowerby, 1822 (as published in the binominal combination *Pecten papyraceus*) ; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 436

parasites of Man, committees of specialists to be established to make proposals for stabilising nomenclature of ; statement in regard to foregoing decision to be issued for the information of specialists 237

Paraturia Spath, 1927, an invalid synonym of *Aturoidea* Vredenberg, 1925 443

" paratype," expression not to be recognised in the *Règles* 185

Paris Session of Meetings of the Commission, *see* Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature, Section (a).

parma Lamarck, 1816, *Scutella*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Echinarachnius* Gray, 1825 534

placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 535

Pavo Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered 582

Pearson, Commissioner Joseph, absence of, from Paris Session 3

election of, in war period, as a Commissioner *vice* Commissioner F. Chapman (deceased) 16

nomination of, to Class 1958 on expiry of term of service of Class 1949 19

nomination of, to be a Member of the Commission for a further term, on abolition of the system of 9-year Classes in the membership of the Commission and consequent reversal of decision to establish a Class 1958 46

pecten Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Anomia pecten*), determination under the plenary powers of application of ; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 436

Pelecanus Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered 582

Pellegrin, Commissioner Jacques, appointment of, to Class 1949 on expiry of term of service of Class 1940 13

death of, reported ; adoption by Commission of Resolution of regret at death of .. 6

Page

pellucida Lamarck, 1805, *Erycina*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Erycina* Lamarck, 1805; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 418

perla Linnaeus, 1758, *Hemerobius*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Chrysopa* Leach, 1815 396

placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 397

personal offence, introduction of a new Article to prevent misuse of the *Règles* for purpose of causing, *see Règles*, etc., New Article (7) 193–194

pertinax Newstead, 1901 (as published in the binominal combination *Walkeriana pertinax*) placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 382

Petalifera Gray, 1847, Secretary to confer with specialists for the purpose of ascertaining whether confusion would be likely to arise if this name were to replace *Aplysiella* Fischer, 1872 389

Peters, Vice-President James L., absence of, from Paris Session 1, 3

election of, in 1939 to newly created office of Assistant Secretary 10

appointment of, to Class 1952 on expiry of term of service of Class 1943 13

reappointment of, as Assistant Secretary, on reappointment to Membership of Commission in 1944 consequent upon the formation of the Class 1952 17

election of, as Vice-President in 1945 *vice* Vice-President C. W. Stiles (deceased) .. 17

nomination of, to be President in succession to President Karl Jordan (resigned) .. 22–23

Petrificata Derbiensia: or Figures and Descriptions of Petrifications collected in Derbyshire, 1809, by Martin (W.), not available under the *Règles* 452

phaeton Drury, [1773] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio phaeton*) placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 496

Phasianus Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered 582

Phlebotomus, emendation to, of *Flebotomus* Rondani, 1840, under the plenary powers; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " (type species *Bibio papatasi* Scopoli, 1786, by monotypy) 359

Pholidocidaris Meek & Worthen, 1869, application for validation of, under the plenary powers, with *Lepidocentrus irregularis* Meek & Worthen, 1869, as type species, Secretary to confer with specialists regarding 513

Phoranthella Townsend, 1915, placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 383

Page

Phyllacanthus Brandt, 1835, validated as of subgeneric status from the date of being so published, under the plenary powers, in so far as necessary, and *Cidarites* (*Phyllacanthus*) *dubius* Brandt, 1835, similarly designated as type species; placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 521

Pieris Schrank, 1801 (type species selected by Latreille, 1810: *Papilio brassicae* Linnaeus, 1758) placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 495

Pilophorus Hahn, 1826, *Cimex clavatus* Linnaeus, 1767, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of; placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 474

Pisa, Dr. S. di Toledo, attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission 62

placenta Linnaeus, 1758, *Echinus*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Arachnoides* Leske, 1778 534

placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 535

Plasmodium Marchiafava & Celli, 1885, *Haemamoeba malariae* Feletti & Grassi, 1889, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of 613

particulars relating to, in the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" confirmed and clarified 619

Plebejus Kluk, 1802 (type species selected by Hemming, 1933: *Papilio argus* Linnaeus, 1758, as now identified by the Commission); placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" 495

plenary powers of the Commission, introduction of an Article prescribing, *see Règles*, etc., New Article (12).

Pleuronectes Linnaeus, 1758, type species of, to be determined as soon as possible, and *Opinion* 68 thereupon cancelled 337

plexippus Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in binominal combination *Papilio plexippus*), designation, under the plenary powers, of species to which, applicable; placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 361

Poda (N.), trivial names based on surname of, to be formed as *podae* not *podai* 206

podalirius Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio podalirius*), application of, determined under the plenary powers; placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 499

Podura Linnaeus, 1758, *Podura aquatica* Linnaeus, 1758, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of 506

entry on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" confirmed, but with different species as type species 507

political offence, introduction of an Article to prevent misuse of the *Règles* for purpose of causing, *see Règles*, etc., New Article (7).

polychloros Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio polychloros*); placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 496

Page

polymnia Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio polymnia*); placed on the Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 458

polymorphic species, adaptation of Article 27 to meet needs of, *see Règles*, etc. Article 27.

Polyommatus Latreille, 1804; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " (type species designated under the plenary powers: *Papilio icarus* Rottemberg, 1775) 484

" Polyplacophora " and " Loricata ", question of relative status of, deferred pending Report by Secretary on general question of Class Names 386

Polypos Leach, 1817, declared to be invalid, because an objective synonym of *Octopus* Cuvier, [1797]; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 589

Polypus Schneider, 1784, declared to be a cheironym possessing no status under the *Règles*; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 589

polypus Schneider, 1784 (as published in the binominal combination *Octopodia polypus*) suppressed under the plenary powers 588

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 590

Polyzoa, *see* Bryozoa.

Pompilus Schneider, 1784, declared to be a cheironym possessing no status under the *Règles* 589

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 590

Ponera Latreille, 1804, application for the designation, under the plenary powers, of *Formica contracta* Latreille, 1802, as type species of, deferred for further information to be obtained 414, 415

Pontia Fabricius, 1807, validated under the plenary powers 456

entry of, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " confirmed (type species, selected by Curtis, 1824: *Papilio daplidice* Linnaeus, 1758) 458

Pontia [Illiger], 1807, suppressed under the plenary powers; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 456

populi Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio populi*); placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 496

Porina Walker, 1856, rejection of application for validation under the plenary powers, of 356–357

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 357

Potamis Hübner, [1806], an invalid " Tentamen " name; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 492, 495

Page

praecox Grassi & Feletti, 1890 (as published in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba praecox*) available for an avian but not for a human malaria parasite 616

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " (as a name for a human malaria parasite) 622

Prescription, Law of, suggested introduction of, into the *Règles*, to be considered with other proposals for securing stability in zoological nomenclature in investigation to be undertaken by the Secretary 232–235

primaevus Volger, 1860 (as published in the binominal combination *Teleosteus primaevus*) suppressed under the plenary powers ; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 430

Primary homonyms, *see* homonymy.

princeps Ehrenberg, 1842 (as published in the binominal combination *Borealis princeps*) ; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 464

Princeps Hübner, [1806], an invalid " Tentamen " name ; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 493, 495

priodon Bronn, 1834 (as published in the binominal combination *Lomatoceras priodon*) ; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 378

procedure of the Commission, reform of, *see* Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature, Section (i).

Prospatangus Lambert, 1902 ; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 528

Protozoa, decision to establish a committee of specialist for the purpose of stabilising nomenclature, particularly of species parasitic to Man (Commissioner's Beltrán's proposal) 235–237

" pseudo-genus ", suggested recognition of, as a nomenclatorial category 273–274

expression " pseudo-genus " available as a technical term but not to be recognised in the *Règles* as a nomenclatorial category 293–294

pseudonyms, status of names published under, *see* anonymously published names.

Pseudoschwagerina Dunbar & Skinner, 1935 (type species, by original designation : *Schwagerina uddeni* Beede & Kniker, 1924) ; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 464

Psodos Treitschke, 1827, emendation of under Article 19, to *Psolos* 231

Psoidos Treitschke, 1825, emendation of, under Article 19, to *Psolos* 231

Page

Psolos (emend. of *Psoidos* and *Psodos*) Treitschke, 1825 (type species, by selection by Duponchel, 1829 : *Phalaena equestrata* Fabricius, 1777) : placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 231

publication, date of, *see* date of publication.

" publication ", meaning of expression defined, *see* *Règles*, etc., Article 25, provisions relating to date of publication.

punctata Cuvier, 1803 (as published in the binominal combination *Laplysia* [sic] *punctata*), question of use of plenary powers to determine species to which applicable, deferred, and to be re-submitted by the Secretary after the close of the Paris Congress 304

punctipes Reuter, 1873, *Oncotylus*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Oncotylus* Fieber, 1858 ; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 474

pusillus Müller (O.F.), 1776, *Echinocyamus*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Echinocyamus* van Phelsum, 1774 ; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 519

purpureus Müller (O.F.), 1776, *Spatagus*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Spatangus* Gray, 1825 527

placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 528

Pyrgus Hübner, [1819] (type species selected by Westwood, 1841 : *Papilio alveolus* Hübner, [1800–1803] [=*Papilio malvae* Linnaeus, 1758]) ; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 495

quadratus Fabricius, 1787 (as published in the binominal combination *Cancer quadratus*) declared to be an available name (*see* Sand Crab) 578

Quartan Malaria Parasite, determination of scientific name of 613

quartana Labbé, 1894 (as published as a subspecific trivial name in the trinominal combination *Haemamoeba laverani* var. *quartana*) declared a subjective junior synonym of *Haemamoeba malariae* Feletti & Grassi, 1889 618

quartanae Celli & Sanfelice, 1891 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*) declared to be a technical designation and not a trivial name 616

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 622

quartanae Kruse, 1892 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*) declared to be a technical designation and not a trivial name 617

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 622

quartanae Lewkowicz, 1897 (as published in connection with the generic name *Haemosporidium*) declared to be a technical designation and not a trivial name 617

Page

quartanae Lewkowicz, 1879, etc. (*continued*).

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 622

quotidianae Celli & Sanfelice, 1891 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*) declared to be a technical designation and not a trivial name 617

placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" 622

Radford, Mr. C. D., attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission 272

Ranson, M. Gilbert, attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission 306

Raphistoma Hall, 1847 validated under the plenary powers; placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" (type species, by selection by de Koninck, 1881: *Maclurea striatus Emmons*, 1842) 428

Raphistoma Rafinesque, 1815, suppressed under the plenary powers: placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" 428

Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique: recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology:

(a) *amendments of general character*

grammatical inconsistencies, elimination of 47

verbal inconsistencies of drafting, elimination of.. .. .. 179, 194

substitution of the singular, for the plural, number for nouns employed in the *Règles* 179, 194

meaningless repetitive phrases, elimination of 195

insertion of paragraph numbers in any Article consisting of more than one paragraph 297–298

subdivision into numbered paragraphs of any Article consisting of two or more sentences, each prescribing a separate regulation 298

serial numbers to be allotted to *Recommendations*, where there is more than one such *Recommendation* comprised in any given Article 298

"Examples" illustrative of particular provisions to be drawn from the works of binominal authors 173–174

"type species" ("espèce type"), expression to be used consistently to denote the concept "type species of a genus" 299–300

"holotype", expression to be used consistently to denote the concept "the specimen designated as the type specimen by the original author"; "syntype", expression to be used consistently to denote the concept "one of a number of specimens used by an author when publishing a new name" where no holotype was designated by that author; "lectotype", expression to be used consistently to denote the concept "the syntype selected by a later author to represent the holotype", in cases where no holotype was designated by the original author 186

"nominal genus", expression to be used consistently to denote the concept represented by a given generic name, as contrasted with the concept represented by a taxonomically accepted genus 179–180

Page

Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique : recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

" nominal species ", expression to be used consistently to denote the concept represented by a given specific name, as contrasted with the concept represented by a taxonomically accepted species 179–180

" specific name ", expression defined 127

" specific trivial name ", expression defined and to be used in place of expression " specific name ", wherever context so requires 128

" subspecific name ", expression defined 128

" subspecific trivial name ", expression defined and to be used in place of expression " subspecific name ", wherever context so requires 128–129

(b) *Amendments relating to particular Articles*

Article 1

provisions relating to the status of a name given to a species originally treated as belonging to the Animal Kingdom, when later assigned to the Vegetable Kingdom, co-ordination of, with Articles 34 and 35 258–259

Article 2

position of subgeneric names, clarification of, in relation to binominal and trinominal nomenclature 96–97

position of names of infra-subspecific forms, definition of, in relation to binominal and trinominal nomenclature 95

Article 3

insertion of a provision that classical Latin is necessarily the standard to which, so far as possible, scientific nomenclature should conform, but that later developments in the Latin language should be taken into account in interpreting this Article, having regard to the fact that Latin, as used in zoological nomenclature, remains a living language 245

Article 4

substitution of the word " thème " (= stem) for the word " radical " (= root) .. 246

criteria to be followed in determining how a family name should be formed under this Article 246

insertion of a provision prescribing method by which the name of a family should be formed from the stem of the name of the type genus 246

incorporation in, of interpretation given in *Opinion* 141 138–139

Recommandations to be added embodying the substance of the " Notes " included in the " summary " to *Opinion* 141 139

insertion of a provision prohibiting the use of words having the terminations " -idae " or " -inae " as names of any unit other than a family or a subfamily, as the case may be, save for certain specified classes of trivial names 261

Recommandation to be added urging authors publishing new family or subfamily names to notify a literature-recording serial such as the *Zoological Record* .. 126

Page

Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique : recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

cases where application of this Article leads to homonymy in family names to be reported to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for determination 244

provisions in relation to the status of the names of genera and lower categories published anonymously or over pseudonyms or initials only to apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to the names of families and subfamilies 215

Secretary to the Commission invited to prepare, in consultation with specialists, a comprehensive Report on 138, 244, 245, 273, 402

Article 5

question of amendment of, to be dealt with by Secretary in Report on Article 4 .. 138

Article 6

generic and subgeneric names not to be co-ordinate for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy 124

drafting amendment in, to co-ordinate text with Article 11 263

Article 7

drafting amendment in, to eliminate confusion between nomenclature and taxonomy 262

Article 8

words ending with terminations "–idae" and "–inae" ineligible for use as generic or subgeneric names, and names so formed to be invalid 216–262

incorporation in, of interpretation given in *Opinion* 183 (relating to the need for a word to be published in the nominative singular, in order to acquire status as a generic name), subject to the insertion also of provisions to deal with status of certain generic names originally published as though in the nominative singular but in fact consisting of words in some other case or number .. 139–140, 195–196

existing *Recommandations* to be converted into mandatory provisions, save the portions which are in the nature of comments thereon, these latter portions to be retained as *Recommandations* and inserted at appropriate points in the new provisions 253

second of existing *Recommandations*, Point (b), second sentence, to be amended and redrafted and a new *Recommendation* added 263–265, 297

Recommandation to be added urging authors to select, as generic names, words which are short and euphonious from the Latin standpoint 171–172

Recommandation to be added urging authors to avoid selecting for a generic name a word which, when pronounced, appears to be a word or combination of words in some language other than Latin, especially where that word or that combination of words has a bizarre or otherwise objectionable meaning 253

Article 12

drafting amendment in, to eliminate confusion between nomenclature and taxonomy 262

Article 13

redrafting of, to eliminate option to use a capital intial letter for certain classes of trivial name 172–173

Page

Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique : recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

Article 14

names formed in contravention of, to be automatically corrected by later authors and to retain original authorship and priority 68, 251

a trivial name consisting of an un-Latinised patronymic to be amended to conform with provisions of *Art.* 14 and to retain its original authorship and priority 251, 252

a Latin adjective in the genitive case in agreement with the trivial name of a species not to be accepted as a subspecific trivial name 624–625

paragraph (1) (a) (relating to trivial names consisting of nouns in the nominative singular in apposition to the generic name) not to apply to trivial names consisting of unlatinised modern patronymics 252

incorporation in, of interpretation given in *Opinion* 64 relating to the status of trivial names consisting of single letters 140

definition of the status of a trivial name consisting of a phonetic representation of the initials of two or more persons 252

clarification of the procedure to be followed in forming trivial names from various classes of patronymics 205–207

an arbitrary combination of letters to be eligible as a trivial name 252

words ending with terminations "–idae" and "–inae" ineligible as trivial names, save where such terminations are inevitable in the case of trivial names based upon the names of places or persons ; names incorrectly so formed to be invalid 262

insertion of a provision making it clear that, where a specific or a subspecific name is published in a list in which it is preceded by a serial letter or by a serial numeral, that letter or numeral does not form part of the trivial name 140, 348

insertion of provisions relating to the gender of generic names and referring to a new Schedule, in which to be incorporated the rules governing the determination of the gender of nouns used as generic names (for use in forming trivial names consisting of adjectives) 246–248, 249–250

Recommandation to be added urging authors to select, as trivial names, words which are short and euphonious from the Latin standpoint 173

Recommandation to be added urging authors not to select, as specific or subspecific trivial names, words already so published for species or subspecies in allied groups 196–197

Recommandation to be added urging authors not to select as a trivial name a compound word having as its second part, as the case may be, either a word in noun form or the same word in adjectival form when there already exists in the genus in question a species or subspecies having a trivial name consisting of the same compound but having, as its second part, the same word in adjectival or noun form as the case may be 242

Recommandation to be added deprecating the selection, as a trivial name, of a word or combination of words which, when pronounced, appear to be a word or combination of words in some language other than Latin, especially where that word or that combination of words have a bizarre or otherwise objectionable meaning 254

Linnaeus, trivial names based on the name of, to be formed as *linnaei* not *linnaeusi* or *linnei* 206

Page

***Régles** Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique :* recommendations for the amendment of clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

Fabricius, trivial names based on the name of, to be formed as ***fabricii*** not as ***fabriciusi*** 206

Poda, trivial names based on the name of, to be formed as *podae* not as *podai* .. 206

Bonnet, three proposals submitted by Professor Pierre, for amendment of, postponed for further consideration 207

Bonnet, two proposals submitted by Professor Pierre, for amendment of, rejection of 207–208

Article 15

names formed in contravention of, to be automatically corrected by later authors and to retain original authorship and priority 68

elimination of existing option to use hyphens to join the several portions of a compound trivial name, save in certain specified cases where the use of such hyphens to be mandatory 197–198

compound trivial names, of which the first portion denotes the presence in the taxonomic unit so named of a specified number of characters, first portion of, to consist of the Latin word for the cardinal number concerned and not to be indicated by a numeral ; such names, if erroneously formed when first published, to be automatically corrected by later authors and to retain original authorship and priority 199–200

Recommandation to be added urging authors proposing to select, as a trivial name, a name based upon the name of a person possessing a compound name, to use for this purpose one only of the names constituting that compound name .. 208–209

a compound trivial name published by a binominal author but, on being first published, printed as two words without a hyphen, not to be rejected but to be corrected by later authors 198

proposed further elaboration of, recommended by Professor Pierre Bonnet, consideration of, postponed 210, 212

Article 16

names formed in contravention of, to be automatically corrected by later authors and to retain original authorship and priority 68

proposal for insertion of a *Recommandation* relating to the formation of geographical adjectival trivial names, postponement of consideration of 210, 212

Article 18

names formed in contravention of, to be automatically corrected by later authors and to retain original authorship and priority 68

drafting amendment to be inserted at end of section (a) 212

drafting amendment to be inserted at end of section (b) 212

additional example to be added at end of section (c) 213

drafting amendments to be inserted at the beginning of section (d) 213

Page

Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique : recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

Article 19

names validly emended under, to retain original authorship and priority 68

interpretation given in *Opinion* 26 (importance to be attached to evidence afforded by the original publication) to be clarified, and incorporated in 142

interpretations given in *Opinions* 27, 36, 41, 60 and 63 (cases of names which should be emended) to be incorporated in, as examples 142–144

co-ordination of, with Article 32 263

Secretary to the Commission to be invited to prepare, in consultation with specialists, a comprehensive Report, with recommendations, on means for clarifying Article 19, for consideration at next meeting of the Congress 141

Article 20

names formed in contravention of, to be automatically corrected by later authors and to retain original authorship and priority 68

proposed amendment of *Recommandation*, postponement of consideration of 210, 212

Article 21

citation of authors' names, clarification of provision regarding 565–566

Article 22

proposed deletion of, recommended by the late Dr. Arthur P. Jacot, rejection of.. 258

method to be followed in citing the author of a name, where the taxonomic unit so named has been described by one author but that description has been published by another author 565–566

existing *Recommandation* relating to the abbreviation of the names of authors to be deleted and revised *Recommandation* substituted therefor 174

Article 23

proposed deletion of, recommended by the American Malacological Union, rejection of 258

insertion of words making it clear that this Article applies only to cases where the generic name is changed and that for this purpose the insertion or omission of a subgeneric name is irrelevant 254

insertion of a provision that this Article does not apply to cases where a name was originally published as a specific trivial name but is later treated as a subspecific trivial name and *vice versa* if no change is made in the genus to which the taxonomic unit concerned is referred 254–255

Article 25, *general provisions*

co-ordination of the Laws of Priority and Homonymy 130

elimination from, of meaningless repetitive phrases 195

Page

Régles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique : recommendations for the amendment of clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

clear distinction to be drawn between question whether a specific name is an available name (Article 25) and question whether the taxonomic unit so named is recognisible (Article 31) 293

a name based on a hypothetical form to have no standing in zoological nomenclature (*Opinion* 2) 144

a name published conditionally not to be rejected on that account and to be attributed to the author by whom it was so published and the date on which it was so published 144–145

Recommandation to be added deprecating the publication of names conditionally .. 145

status of a name which, prior to publication, was in currency as a manuscript name (*Opinion* 4) 145–146, 259–260, 563

Recommandation to be added deprecating the publication of names which previously had acquired some currency as manuscript names 563–564

status of a name which, prior to being validly published, appeared in a work rejected for nomenclatorial purposes (*Opinion* 145) 165, 350

status of a name which, prior to being published with an indication, had been published as a *nomen nudum* 259–260, 563

Recommandation to be added deprecating the publication, with an indication, of a name previously published as a *nomen nudum* 563–564

name used as a group name between genus and species level to rank as a subgeneric generic name as from date of being so published if in the nominative singular or having a termination consistent with that case and number 443

status of a name published as an invalid emendation of a previously published name (*Opinion* 148) 148, 183

status of an apparent new name due to an error in a literature-recording serial .. 175

status of a specific name published jointly with a new generic name, no separate description being given for the species so named (*Opinion* 43) 149

status of a name published anonymously or over pseudonyms or initials only (a) on or before 31st December, 1950 and (b) after that date 213–215

Recommandation to be added recommending that, where a name is published anonymously or over a pseudonym or initials only but the name of the author concerned is known, the author's name should be cited but placed within square brackets 215

Recommandation to be added urging authors validating a name published anonymously or over a pseudonym or initials only published after 31st December, 1950 to notify his action to a literature-recording serial such as the *Zoological Record* .. 215

Recommandation to be inserted regarding languages in which descriptions of new taxonomic units should be published : (provisions on this subject in existing *Appendice* to be deleted) 221

a generic name which, when first published, was an invalid emendation of a previously published generic name becomes an available name if the earlier name is itself invalid and if the emended name differs from the original name sufficiently not to be a homonym thereof 148

Page

Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique : recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

a trivial name which, when first published, was an invalid emendation of a previously published trivial name becomes an available name if the earlier name is itself invalid and if the emended name differs from the original name sufficiently not to be a homonym thereof 183–184

a trivial name to have no status in zoological nomenclature unless published in connection with a generic name 129

a trivial name not invalidated by reason of having been originally published in combination with an invalid generic name 227–228

a trivial name not invalidated by reason of descriptions of parts of two or more animals having been included in the description of the taxonomic unit so named (*Opinion* 88) 151–152

status of a generic name published in a specific synonymy 350–351

proposed insertion of a provision relating to the suppression of trivial names found to be totally misleading, rejection of 288–289

Recommandation to be added urging authors of new names for taxonomic units belonging to categories to which the Law of Priority is applicable to notify the publication of those names to a literature-recording serial such as the *Zoological Record* 126

Recommandation to be added deprecating the publication of new names in abstracts 221–222

Recommandation to be added deprecating the publication of new names in keys 222–223

Recommandation to be added urging authors not to publish a name as a new name on more than one occasion (*Declaration* 6) 169

Recommandation to be added urging authors publishing new names clearly to distinguish those as new (*Declaration* 6) 168–169

Recommandation to be added urging authors publishing names of new taxonomic units to give particulars of the position in the Animal Kingdom of the unit so named (*Declaration* 11) 170

Article 25, *provisions relating to publication*

meaning of the expression " divulgué dans une publication " in relation to the publication of a scientific name defined (a) in respect of names published on or before 31st December, 1950 and (b) after that date 165, 215–221

certain types of action not constituting publication to be enumerated 219–220

status of a name given currency through appearing in advance separates (*Opinion* 59) 146

Recommandations to be added urging authors not to distribute separates in advance of publication of paper concerned 167–168

status of a name given currency through the circulation of proof sheets (*Opinion* 87) 146

status of a name given currency through the distribution by an author of a note explaining a photograph or other figure containing the name in question (*Opinion* 191) 146–147

Page

Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique : recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

cases of doubt on the question of publication to be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision 219

Recommandation to be added urging authors and editors to affix certain particulars to books and serials and parts thereof for the purpose of facilitating determination of question as to whether the book or serial has been duly published 220

Recommandation to be added deprecating publication of new names for taxonomic units in books or serials reproduced otherwise than by printing 220–221

Recommandation to be added deprecating publication of new names for taxonomic units in the non-scientific press 221

names of identical date published in the same book or serial, relative priority of, to be determined in accordance with principle of page precedence " instead of that of the " first reviser " 330

Article 25, provisions relating to the date of publication.

expression " le plus anciennement designé " to be rigidly construed and cases of books of identical date to be referred to the Commission for decision on priority to be accorded 257

method to be followed in determining the date of publication of a given book or serial or part thereof 223–225

cases where two books or serial publications or parts thereof are, or are deemed to have been, published on the same day to be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for determination of relative priority to be assigned to new names respectively published therein 257

Recommandation to be added on the subject of the method to be adopted in citing the dates attributed to scientific names 225–226

method to be followed in determining the date to be assigned for purposes of the Law of Priority to names published in books or serial publications appearing in instalments where a portion of the description of the taxonomic unit to which a new name is applied appears in one instalment on one date and the remainder in the next following instalment on a later date 226–227, 293

Recommandation to be added deprecating the splitting of the description of a new taxonomic unit between two successively issued instalments of a given book or serial publication 227

Recommandation to be added the insertion in zoological books and serial publications of particulars of exact date of publication of the book or serial concerned and of its several Parts (*Declarations* 3 and 8) 170

Article 25, *Proviso* (*a*).

re-definition of the meaning of the expression " indication " in relation to generic names and cancellation of interpretation in regard thereto given in *Opinion* 1 .. 78–80

clarification and incorporation in, of interpretation relating to the meaning of the expression " indication " given in *Opinion* 1 other than the portion relating to generic names 148–149, 345

status of a generic and specific trivial name where, prior to 1st January 1931, both names were published simultaneously and a joint description was given for both (*Opinion* 43) 149

Page

Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique : recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

status of a generic name published prior to 1st January 1931 when that name is based solely on a figure (illustration) without other indication 255

significance to be attached to the citation, in an original description, of a type locality (*Opinion* 52) 150

significance to be attached to the citation, in an original description, of a geological horizon, in the case of a fossil species 256–257

significance to be attached to the citation, in the original description of a parasitic species, of the name of the host species without any other particulars 256

status of a name based on the description of the work of an animal, without any description of the animal itself 255

Recommandation to be added urging authors, so far as possible, to avoid establishing new taxonomic units based solely upon the work of an animal 255

Article 25, *Proviso* (*b*)

expression " nomenclature binominale " to be substituted for expression " nomenclature binaire " 63–66

grant to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of special powers to deal with hard cases arising out of the elimination of the expression " nomenclature binaire " 65

expression " principes de la nomenclature binominale ", definition of 175

status of names originally published before 1758 when republished after 1757, definition of (*Opinion* 5) 150

names published before 1st January 1931 by binominal authors in books dealing with classification down to the genus level but no lower not to be rejected as non-binominal 309

Article 25, *Proviso* (*c*).

Paragraph (1) : expression " which differentiate . . . " to be deleted and revised wording substituted therefor 70–71

Recommandation to be added urging authors, when publishing new names for taxonomic units to include comparisons with allied units 71

Paragraph (2) : expression " definite bibliographic reference " to be deleted and revised wording substituted therefor 68–70

Recommandation to be added regarding method of citation desirable when a name is published as a substitute for an earlier but invalid name 69–70

Paragraph (3) : expression " definite unambiguous designation of the type species " to be deleted and revised wording substituted therefor 71–72, 177

Recommandation to be added regarding method desirable to be adopted for designating type species of a genus on the first publication of the generic name 72–73

point of time as from which Proviso (c) operative 250

generic names published subsequent to 31st December 1930, to be available only if type species designated or indicated either (1) under Rule (b) or Rule (c) or (2) under Rule (a) or Rule (d) as those Rules existed prior to Paris Congress .. 177

Page

Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique: recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

Article 26.

expression " nomenclature binominale " to be substituted for expression " nomenclature binaire " 65

relative status of 10th edition of *Systema Naturae* and other works published in 1758, clarification of (*Opinion* 3) 150–151

Proviso to be added securing availability for names published in Clerck's *Aranei svecici* as from 1758 with priority over 10th edition of *Systema Naturae* of Linnaeus 315–319

Article 27.

adaptation of, to meet requirements of polymorphic species 239–240

Article 28.

substitution of " page precedence " principle for " first reviser " principle in provision at present contained in 257–258, 328–331

the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature instructed to deal with hard cases arising out of the substitution of the " page precedence " principle for the " first reviser " principle 330

existing *Recommandation* to be deleted consequentially upon substitution of " page precedence " principle for " first reviser " principle in this Article .. 330–331

Article 29.

Recommandation to be deleted consequential upon expanded *Recommandations* dealing with the same subject being added to Articles 25 and 30 73

Article 30, *general provisions.*

use of a generic name prior to 1758 irrelevant for purposes of Article 30 .. 347–348

words to be inserted to make it clear that the whole Article applies to generic names published before 1st January 1931, but that names published subsequent to that date are subject only to Rules (a) to (d) 176–177

Rules (a) and (d), additions to, made by Paris Congress, to apply only to names published before 1st January 1931 176–177

Recommandations at present incorrectly lettered in sequence with Rules (a) to (g) to be given a separate series of notation, to make it clear that they are *Recommandations* only and not mandatory provisions 180–181

procedure to be followed in determining what species are to be treated as having been originally included species, in cases where one or more such species are cited by the original author of a genus 179, 180

procedure to be followed in determining what species are to be treated as having been originally included species, in cases where no species was distinctly referred to the genus by its original author (*Opinion* 46) 159–160, 346

type species of a genus not liable to change on the union of that genus with another genus on taxonomic grounds (*Opinion* 164) 157

Page

Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique : recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

author of the name of a genus to be assumed correctly to have identified the species referred by him thereto (*Opinions* 65 and 168) 158

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to have the duty to use their plenary powers to vary the type species of a genus based upon a misidentified type species, save where it is of the opinion that greater confusion than uniformity would result therefrom 158–159

author of the name of a genus to be assumed correctly to have identified species designated by him as the type species ; an author selecting an originally included species to be the type species to be assumed correctly to have identified the species so selected (*Opinion* 14) 158, 159

a nominal species, the original description of which contained descriptions of parts of two or more species to be eligible to be the type species of a genus, the identity of the species in question to be determined under Article 31 (*Opinion* 88) 151–152

type species of a genus bearing a name which is an emendation of a previously published generic name to be the same species as the type species of the genus, the name of which was so emended (*Opinion* 148) 148

" designate " and " designation ", expressions to be used consistently to denote the determination of the type species of a nominal genus by the original author thereof and expressions " select " and " selection " in relation to any such determination by a subsequent author 179

" select " and " selection," use of expressions, *see* " designate"

" type species " (" espèce "), expression to be used to denote the concept " type species of a nominal genus " 300

" genotype ", *Recommandation* to be added deprecating use of expression 300

Article 30, *Rule* (a).

significance to be attached to the use of the expression " n.g., n.sp." on the first publication of a generic name published prior to 1st January 1931 (*Opinion* 7) 152–153

Article 30, *Rule* (c).

a genus to be treated as monotypical when one nominal species only is cited as referable thereto, irrespective of the stated or implied intentions of the author of the generic name (*Opinion* 47) 153

Article 30, *Rule* (d).

application of, to a generic name published prior to 1st January 1931, where there is cited in the synonymy of one of the originally included species a pre-1758 univerbal specific name consisting of the same word as the generic name (*Opinion* 16) 154–155

application of, to a generic name published prior to 1st January 1931, where one of the included species has a synonym bearing as its trivial name a name consisting of the same word as the generic name, even if that synonym is not cited at the time of the original publication of the generic name (*Opinion* 18) .. 153–154

Article 30, *Rule* (e).

definition of the expression " species inquirenda " 298–299

Page

Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique : recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

Article 30, *Rule* (*f*).

species to be regarded as the type species or as a species eligible to be selected as the type species, of a substitute genus, the name of which was published prior to 1st January 1931, where either genus, when originally established, contained species which were recognisable but which were not on that occasion cited under binominal names (*Opinion* 35) 155

species eligible for selection as type species of a genus having a substitute name published prior to 1st January 1931 (where no type species had been designated, indicated or selected for the genus so renamed) or of the genus, the name of which was so replaced (*Opinion* 35) 155

Article 30, *Rule* (*g*)

a type selection by a subsequent author not invalidated if that author misidentified species so selected (*Opinion* 14) 157–158

citation of a nominal species as the type species of a genus to be accepted as a valid type selection, irrespective of whether the author concerned regarded himself as selecting a type species or believed that the species in question had previously been designated or selected as such 181–182

a type selection, related to any place of publication other than the original place of publication, of a generic name not to be valid 348

citation of a nominal species as the type species of a genus to be accepted as a valid type selection, even if the nominal species in question was not an originally included species, in cases where the author so citing that species synonymises it with an originally included nominal species 180

selection of a type species in a literature-recording serial to be accepted (*Opinion* 172) 161

Recommandation to be added urging authors selecting a type species for a genus established prior to 1st January 1931 to notify that selection to a literature-recording serial such as the *Zoological Record* 126

any species included in two or more genera established prior to 1st January 1931 with identical limits but with no designated type species, eligible for selection as the type species of any or all of the genera concerned (*Opinion* 10) 156

a species included in a genus established prior to 1st January 1931 but not then cited under a binominal name eligible for selection as the type species of the genus (*Opinion* 35) 155–156

a genus established prior to 1st January 1931 with two but not more than two species, neither of which was designated or indicated as the type species to have, where one of those species is later designated as the type species of a monotypical genus, the species not so designated as its type species (*Opinion* 6) 157

a species included in a genus established prior to 1st January 1931 to be eligible to be selected as the type species of that genus, notwithstanding the fact that it is already the type species of some other genus (*Opinion* 62) 156–157

species eligible for selection as the type species of a nominal genus, the name of which was published in a generic synonymy, Secretary to prepare comprehensive Report on, with recommendations 351–352

Page

Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique: recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

Article 31

- revision of, by the substitution of direct, for relative, provisions and the elimination of confusion between nomenclature and taxonomy 73–76, 292–293
- insertion in, of provisions parallel to those in Articles 29 and 30 74–76
- method to be followed in determining the identity of a nominal species (whether composite or not) by means of the holotype or, where there is no holotype, by the selection of a lectotype or of a figure or previously published description to represent the lectotype 74–76
- where specialists agree that identity of given nominal species unrecognisable, name in question to be treated as *nomen dubium ;* cases of disagreement to be submitted to the Commission 76
- second sentence of Article 31, as it existed prior to the Paris Congress to be retained 76
- principles laid down in relation to the selection of the type species of a genus by *Opinions* 6 and 62 to apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to the selection of the lectotype of a species 76
- Article 31, as now revised to apply to a nominal species, the original description of which included descriptions of parts of more than one species (*Opinion* 88) 152
- type specimen of a nominal species bearing an emended name automatically the same specimen as that which is the type specimen of the nominal species, the name of which has been emended 183
- "neotypes" not to be recognised at present, but Secretary invited to prepare, in consultation with specialists, comprehensive Report on this question 192–193
- Secretary invited to prepare Report, in consultation with specialists, on certain other outstanding problems in connection with Article 31 502

Article 32

- co-ordination of, with Article 19 263
- co-ordination of, with Article 25 293
- proposal for express provision for suppressing names when totally inappropriate, rejection of 289

Article 34

- co-ordination of, with Article 1(3) 258–259
- co-ordination of, with Article 25 130
- transfer to, of *Recommandations* relating to generic names hitherto attached to Article 36 265
- criteria to be adopted in determining whether one generic name is a homonym of another generic name (*Opinion* 147) 130–131, 161–162 243
- a generic name to be rejected as a homonym if it has previously been published as an emendation of another generic name (*Opinion* 148) 163

Page

Régles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique : recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

a generic name which is the older of a pair of homonyms not to be ignored on the ground that its type species is unrecognisable, its name being a *nomen dubium* .. 398–399

a generic name based on a modern patronymic, of which the first portion consists of the particle " Mac- " or " Mc- " to be rejected as a homonym of a previously published generic name if it differs therefrom only in the spelling used for the foregoing particle 208

Recommandation to be added urging authors to avoid the publication of a generic name which differs from a previously published generic name only through having as the accented syllable the syllable " en " or " an " as the case may be .. 243

a generic name not to be rejected as a homonym on the ground that it has previously been published as an Ordinal name or as a name of higher rank (*Opinion* 102) .. 164

Recommandation to be added deprecating the selection, as generic names, of words previously published as an Ordinal name or as the name of a category of higher rank 164–165

a generic name not to be rejected as a homonym on the ground that it has previously been published in a work rejected for nomenclatorial purposes (*Opinion* 145) 165, 350

a generic name not to be rejected as a homonym on the ground that it has previously been published as a generic name through an error in a literature-recording serial 175

provision at present forming a *Recommandation* to Article 36, relating to the relative precedence to be accorded to homonyms of identical date when originally published respectively as generic and subgeneric names, to be incorporated in Article 34 as a substantive provision 265

names differing from one another only by the termination " -mus " and " -nus ", no need for express definition of status of, in view of fact that provisions now to be inserted in Article 34, prescribing the conditions in which one generic name is to be treated as a homonym of another such name are comprehensive 349

Articles 35 *and* 36

existing Articles to be cancelled and revised comprehensive provisions substituted therefor 97–105, 107–125

co-ordination of, with Article 1(3) 258–259

co-ordination of, with Article 25 130

expressions " primary homonym " and " secondary homonym " to be introduced into *Règles* and defined, and expression " homonym " to be defined .. 118–119, 344–345

expression " specific name " to be defined 127

expression " specific trivial name " to be introduced into *Règles* and defined 127–128

expression " subspecific name " to be defined 128

expression " subspecific trivial name " to be introduced into *Règles* and defined 128–129

the later published of any pair of primary homonyms to be permanently rejected and to be replaced either by a new name or by a previously published name for the species or subspecies concerned 119–121

Page

Régles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique : recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

where, prior to 1st January 1951, the later published of any pair of identical trivial names was rejected on account of secondary homonymy, that rejection to be accepted as valid whether or not the two species or subspecies in question were at the time still regarded as congeneric with one another 121

after 31st December 1950, the later published of any pair of identical trivial names to be rejected on account of secondary homonymy, whenever, but only if, the two species or subspecies in question are still regarded as congeneric with one another 121

where the later published of any pair of identical trivial names is validly rejected on account of secondary homonymy the name so rejected to be rejected permanently and to be replaced in like manner to a rejected primary homonym 121, 122–124

a new trivial name given to a species or subspecies consequent upon the invalid rejection, after 31st December 1950, of a trivial name on account of a secondary homonymy to have no status in zoological nomenclature 123–124

Recommandation to be added urging authors rejecting and replacing either a primary homonym or a trivial name on account secondary homonymy to notify such rejection and replacement to a literature-recording serial such as the *Zoological Record* 119, 122

subgeneric names not to be treated as coordinate with generic names for the purposes of specific homonymy and therefore to be ignored for the purpose of determining whether a given name is a homonym of another name 124

subspecific trivial names to be subject to the same provisions as specific trivial names, both *inter se* and as between one specific, and one subspecific, trivial name 124–125

the subspecific trivial name of the nominotypical subspecies of a polytypic species to be exempt from the rules governing specific homonymy 191

list of differences in spelling to be ignored in determining whether trivial names of certain classes are homonyms of other names belonging to those classes to be the same as those for generic names, except for the addition of a provision corresponding with that in the existing Article 35 (3) (e) 162–163

provision in the third paragraph of existing Article 35 not to be included in the revised Article 125

addition to provision corresponding with that in Article 35 (3) (e) of a provision relating to variations in spelling due to differences in transliteration of the consonental " i " and to the use of the letters " f " and " ph " 243

a trivial name not to be rejected on the ground of apparent homonymy arising from undetected generic homonymy (earlier decision in opposite sense later reversed) 121–122, 343–345

a trivial name to be rejected on the ground of homonymy where previously the name of a species or subspecies in the same genus has been emended so as to form a name identical therewith 184

the earlier published of any pair of identical specific names not to be ignored for purposes of the Law of Homonymy on the ground that the species so named is unrecognisable, its name being a *nomen dubium* 398

a trivial name based on a modern patronymic, of which the first portion consists of the particle " Mac- " or " Mc " to be rejected as a homonym of a previously published trivial name for a species or subspecies in the same genus if it differs therefrom only in the spelling used for the foregoing particle 208

Page

Régles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique : recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

Recommandation to be added urging authors to avoid the publication of a trivial name which differs from a previously published trivial name for a species or subspecies in the same genus only through having as its accented syllable the syllable " en " or " an " as the case may be 243

Recommandation to be added urging authors to avoid the publication of a compound trivial names which differs from a previously published trivial name for a species or subspecies in the same genus or in allied genera solely by reason of the fact that one portion of that name is in the one case in noun form and in the other case in adjectival form 240–242, 295–296

the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to suppress a compound trivial name differing only from another such name by one portion of the name being in the one case in noun form and in the other case in adjectival form, in cases where the Commission is satisfied that the co-existence of the two names in question has caused, or is likely to cause, confusion 242

a trivial name not to be rejected as a homonym on the ground that it has previously been published as an Ordinal name or as a name of a category higher rank .. 164

Recommandation to be added deprecating the selection, as a trival name, of any word previously published as an Ordinal name or as the name of a category of higher rank 164–165

a trivial name not to be rejected on account of homonymy on the ground that it has previously been published for a species or subspecies in the same genus in a work rejected for nomenclatorial purposes (*Opinion* 145) 165, 350

a trivial name not to be rejected on account of homonymy on the ground that it has previously been published for a species or subspecies in the same genus, where such publication is due to an error on the part of a literature-recording serial 175

transfer to, of *Recommandations* relating to trivial names hitherto attached to Article 36 265

substitution of the word " thème " for the word " radical " in the third and fourth of the *Recommandations* now to be transferred from Article 36 265–266

provision relating to the relative precedence to be accorded to homonyms of identical date when originally published respectively as specific and subspecific trivial names to be converted into a mandatory provision on transfer from Article 36 265

the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes books or papers published by irresponsible or malicious persons for the deliberate purpose of creating secondary homonyms or providing opportunities for publishing new names 124

Appendice

conversion of, into a Schedule 65

status of provisions in, definition of 73

Section " A ", deletion from, of first sentence (languages recommended for use in describing new taxonomic units) consequent upon transfer of *Recommandation* on this subject to Article 25 221

Page

Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique : recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

deletion from, of second sentence and next following sentence (sentence placed between Section " A " and "B ") relating to type specimens consequent upon the insertion in the *Règles* of a comprehensive Article (and accompanying *Recommandations*) dealing with this subject 185

Section to be added prescribing the method by which a word originally written in the Cyrillic alphabet should be transliterated into the Latin alphabet, when such a word is made into, or made part of, a scientific name 228–229

proposed insertion in Section " F " of an additional section relating to the transliteration of the Latin letters " v " and " i," consideration of, postponed.. 210, 212

Section " G," consequential amendments necessary in view of addition of a Section relating to the transliteration of words from Cyrillic alphabet, to be made in 229, 250–251

NOTE : For particulars relating to decisions regarding other Schedules, see " New Articles and Schedules, Nos. (25) *to* (30).

(c) *New Articles and New Schedules*

(1) New Article recognising for nomenclatorial purposes the category " infra-subspecific name " and laying down rules governing this category of name and clarifying its relationship to the names of subspecies 81–82, 83–96

The foregoing New Article to include provisions on the following matters :

" subspecific name ", expression to be defined 89

" infra-subspecific name " expression to be introduced into the *Règles* and defined.. 89

infra-specific names to be classified initially as subspecific names or infra-subspecific names by reference to the objective criterion provided by the manner of original publication 91–92

standard to be adopted for determining whether a given name is a subspecific name or only the name of an infra-subspecific form to be less rigorous in the case of a name published prior to 1st January 1951, the date on which the new scheme to come into operation, than for a name published prior to that date ; standard to be laid down in the mandatory provisions to be a minimum standard, in order to prevent names from being invalidated for technical nomenclatorial reasons 90–92

Recommandation to be inserted prescribing ideal method to be aimed at by authors, when publishing new names intended to be subspecific names .. 90

Recommandations to be inserted regarding the manner to be adopted in citing either a subspecific name or an infra-subspecific name at the time of original publication, in order clearly to distinguish the category to which the name in question belongs 92

infra-subspecific trivial names to be co-ordinate with one another but not with the trivial names of species and subspecies and *vice versa* (establishment of separate realms for these classes of name) 93

rules governing the transfer of a name from the realm of infra-subspecific trivial names to the realm of specific and subspecific trivial names and *vice versa* .. 93–94

method to be followed in citing a previously published name for an infra-subspecific form 94

Page

Régles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique: recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

  Recommandation to be added regarding the method to be adopted in citing an infra-subspecific name at the time of original publication 92

  Recommandation urging authors publishing descriptions of, and naming, infra-subspecific forms, to compare the forms so named with some previously named such form 93

  Recommandation to be added urging authors elevating infra-subspecific trivial names to be specific or subspecific trivial names to notify such elevation to a literature-recording serial such as the *Zoological Record* 94

  application, subject to certain specified exceptions, to the trivial names of infra-subspecific forms of the provisions of the *Règles* relating to the trivial names of species and subspecies 95

  grant to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of power to prescribe, subject to certain conditions, the use of uniform technical designations for parallel infra-subspecific forms occurring in groups of allied species, such designations to be used in preference to any trivial name previously published for such a form of any of the species concerned, the words used for such designations to be ineligible for use for other infra-subspecific forms in the genera to which the species concerned are referred 95–96

(2) New Article introducing, and defining the expressions "holotype", "syntype" and "lectotype" and regulating generally the positions of type specimens (Article in replacement and amplification of provisions hitherto placed between Sections "A" and "B" of the *Appendice*) 184–188

The foregoing New Article to include provisions on the following matters:

  "holotype", "syntype", "lectotype", definition of, in relation to type specimens of all taxonomic units from species to infra-subspecific form; expressions to be substituted, as appropriate, for the word "type" in the *Règles* 185–187

  "neotype", question whether to be recognised as a category of type specimen to be the subject of a Report to be prepared by the Secretary in consultation with specialists 191–193

  Delaratory Article stating that type specimens are the property of science to be inserted 186

  Recommandation urging authors and other persons is possession of "holotypes" and "lectotypes" to deposit those specimens in a museum or other institution where they will be safely preserved and will be accessible for purposes of research 187

  Recommandation urging authors of new names always to designate a holotype, and specifying particulars which it is desirable should be published regarding the holotype when a new taxonomic unit is described and named 187–188

  Recommandation regarding particulars which it is desirable should be published regarding a lectotype when such a type specimen is selected from a series of syntypes 188

  Recommandation regarding the need for affixing a prominent label to every holotype or lectotype 188

  Recommandation urging authors to avoid the use of the expression "co-type" 190–191

(3) New Article prescribing the method to be adopted in naming the nominotypical subspecies of a polytypic species 191

Page

Régles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique : recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

(4) New Article prescribing that Latin names (generic or trivial) bestowed upon monsters (e.g. Schistosome Monsters) have no status in zoological nomenclature 363–364

(5) New Article prescribing that, where a genus is divided into groups and there are applied to those groups Latin designations which are, or which appear to be, nouns in the nominative singular, the designations so published are to be treated as having been published as subgeneric names 443

(6) New Article embodying the substance of the Code of Ethics (*Declarations* 1 and 12) 167

(7) New Article providing for the prevention of the misuse of the *Règles* for the purpose of giving political, religious or personal offence 193–194

(8) New Article deprecating the use of intemperate language in the discussion of zoological nomenclature (*Declaration* 4) 167

(9) New Article recommending that at least once in any given paper an author should cite a bibliographical reference for each name cited therein (*Declaration* 7) 170

(10) New Article defining the purposes and scope of the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " and of the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology ", prescribing the status of a name placed on the " Official List " and defining the duties of the International Commission of Zoological Nomenclature in relation that " List " 267–269, 271, 334–335

(11) New Article defining the purpose and scope of the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology ", and of the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology ", prescribing the status of a name placed on the " Official List ", and defining the duties of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in relation to that " List " .. 270–271,334–335, 627–628

(12) New Article embodying the Plenary Powers Resolution of 1913, subject to certain amendments and additions 51–56, 65, 124, 231–232, 242, 296

The foregoing New Article to contain provisions on the following matters:

applications for the use of the plenary powers for the protection of long-established names and nomenclatorial usages to be given special consideration .. 323–324

plenary powers available for dispelling doubts as to how the *Règles* should be applied as well as for suspending their operation 324

plenary powers to be used to validate well-established generic names published by non-binominal authors where these found to be invalid consequent upon the elimination of the expression " nomenclature binaire " from Article 25 .. 65

plenary powers to be used for suppressing books or papers where the Commission satisfied that there has been a deliberate misuse of the *Règles* for the purpose of creating secondary homonyms and consequently of providing opportunities for publishing new names 124

plenary powers to be used to vary the type species of genera based upon misidentified type species, save where Commission consider that confusion would result from such action 158–159

plenary powers to be used where Commission satisfied that concurrent use in the same or allied genera of compound trivial names differing from one another only by the fact that one portion of the name is in one case in noun form and in the other case in adjectival form, has caused, or is likely to cause, confusion .. 242

Page

Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique : recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

plenary powers to be used, as appropriate, to prevent confusion from arising in particular cases through the substitution, in Article 28, of the "page precedence" principle for the "first reviser" principle in determining relative priority to be assigned to two or more names published in the same work .. 330

correct name of a taxonomic unit to be specified by the Commission when use of plenary powers in relation to its name refused 331

procedure to be followed in the use of the plenary powers to suppress a name (a) for the purpose of validating some later use thereof, and (b) for the purpose of validating some other name, clarification of 338–339

(13) New Article requiring the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, in consultation with specialists, to determine the status of new names published in any book of doubtful status which the Commission, on an application submitted, may have declared to be available for nomenclatorial purposes, with a view to placing those names on the appropriate "Official List" or "Official Index," as the case may be, or to the use of the plenary powers to suppress any such name the introduction of which would lead to instability or confusion .. 310

(14) New Article prescribing the functions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (including any new functions conferred thereon by the Paris Congress) 290–292

(15) New Article prescribing the rules governing the composition of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 325–327

(16) New Article prescribing the form and scope of the By-Laws of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 327–328, 331

(17) New Article providing for the automatic cancellation of *Opinions* relating to individual nomenclatorial problems, on their contents being entered in the Schedule to the *Règles* established for the recording of such decisions .. 332–333

(18) New Article prescribing the status of interpretations of the *Règles* given by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in *Declarations* .. 294–295

(19) New Article enjoining authors, when discovering that a well-known name is invalid or a well-known nomenclatorial usage is incorrect, at once to submit the case to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for such action as may be considered appropriate, and in the mean time to refrain from disturbing existing nomenclatorial practice.. 234–235

(20) New Article defining the status of the provisions embodied in the former *Appendice* (now a Schedule) to the *Règles* 73

(21) New Article prescribing the procedure to be followed in amending the *Règles* 295

(22) New Article prescribing the long and short titles of the *Règles*, as amended by the Paris Congress 260

(23) New Article prescribing the date of entry into force of the *Règles*, as amended by the Paris Congress 342

(24) New Article repealing the existing *Règles* as from the date of entry into force of the *Règles*, as amended by the Paris Congress 260

(25) New Schedule in which to be recorded all decisions taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature under its plenary powers and relevant *Opinion* cancelled 65, 332

(26) New Schedule in which to be recorded all decisions taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on individual nomenclatorial problems, otherwise than under its plenary powers 261, 333

Page

Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique : recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, submitted to the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

(27) New Schedule specifying the rules governing the gender of Latin nouns or Latinised Greek nouns and the formation of the genders of adjectives, for the guidance of zoologists in determining the gender of generic names and of citing adjectival trivial names in agreement therewith 249–250

(28) New Schedule or Schedules containing the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " and the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 333–334

(29) New Schedule or Schedules containing the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " and the " Official Index of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 333–334

(30) Schedules, order in which, to be arranged, to be left to the jurists to determine 261

Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique : arrangements for preparation, and promulgation of text of, as revised by the Paris Congress.

preparation of texts for inclusion in the substantive French text of the *Règles* (i) for the purpose of completing existing gaps, and (ii) for the purpose of giving effect to decisions by the Paris Congress to be entrusted to jurists ; literal English translation of revised substantive French text of *Règles* to be prepared by jurists ; draft of substantive French text and of English translation, when received from the jurists, to be submitted (i) to all members of the Commission and (ii) to all the zoologists who served as Alternate Commissioners at Paris, for scrutiny for the purpose of ensuring the draft text gives full effect to the decisions taken by the Paris Congress, a period of three months being reserved for the receipt of comments from Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners 77

comments on draft texts received from Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners to be examined by the Executive Committee (replaced under a later decision by an *ad hoc* Committee of Three (*q.v.*)), by whom all outstanding questions to be settled 78, 284–285

text, when finally settled by Executive Committee (replaced under a later decision by an *ad hoc* Committee of Three) to be published as soon as possible by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature 78, 342

German, Italian and Spanish translations to be prepared for publication as soon as possible after the publication of the French/English edition 78

Editorial Committee of Three substituted for the Executive Committee as the body by which comments on the texts received from the jurists received from Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners to be examined and by which the text to be finally settled 284, 286

Editorial Committee of Three, composition of, prescribed.. 629–630

zoologists recommended to guide themselves by the *Official Record of Proceedings* pending the formal promulgation of the revised text of the *Règles ; Règles,* as revised by Paris Congress, to enter into force immediately upon publication.. .. 342

rejected and invalid names (generic and trivial), introduction of " Official Indexes " for recording of, *see* " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " and " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ..

religious offence, introduction of a new Article to prevent misuse of the *Règles* for purpose of causing, *see Règles,* etc., New Article (7).

Remora Forster, 1771, declared non-existant under the *Règles* ; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 539

Page

Remora Gill, 1862, placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " (type species, by absolute tautonomy : *Echeneis remora Linnaeus*, 1758) 539

Remora Gouan, 1770, declared non-existent under the *Règles* ; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 539

remora Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Echeneis remora*) placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 539

Report by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology on work performed during the Congress :

- arrangements for preparation of 277–278
- detailed examination of draft of, jointly with the Section on Nomenclature .. 283–287
- amendment of draft in certain respects 285–287
- unanimous adoption of draft, as amended in discussion, to be the Report of the Commission to the Congress 287
- Secretary to the Commission requested to sign the Report, as adopted, and to submit it forthwith to the Section on Nomenclature for adoption and approval, subject to the understanding that such changes, if any, as the Commission might wish to make in the light of further work performed before the close of its last meeting in Paris should be made therein, on the concurrence of the Section on Nomenclature being obtained 287–288
- supplementary points on, submitted to the Section on Nomenclature 423–424, 559, 564, 566, 591, 625, 628, 630, 630–631

Retiolites Barrande, 1850, validated under the plenary powers with *Gladiolites geinitzianus* Barrande, 1850, as type species ; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 379

reviser, first, principle of, *see* page precedence

Rhinoceros Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology ", to be considered 582

Rhipidophyllum Sandberger, 1889, validated under the plenary powers ; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " (type species, by monotypy ; *Rhipidophyllum vulgare* Sandberger, 1889) 430

Rhopalum Stephens, 1829, application for the validation of, under the plenary powers, deferred for further information to be obtained 415

Richter, Commissioner Rudolf, absence of, from Paris Session 3

- nomination of, to be a Member of the Class 1952 on the expiry of the term of service of the Class 1943, reservation by Commission regarding attitude towards 13

Page

Richter, Commissioner Rudolf, etc. (*continued*).

  decision not to confirm nomination of, to Class 1952, in order to provide German zoologists with a fresh opportunity of expressing their wishes as to their representation on the Commission consequent upon the political and other changes resulting from the close of the war .. 18, 19

Riley, Mr. N. D., appointment of, as an Alternate Commissioner *vice* Commissioner W. T. Calman .. 4

  attendance by, at Meetings of the Commission 6, 37, 62, 83, 107, 190, 230, 239, 272, 280, 306, 354, 425, 649

  approval by, of Minutes of Paris Meetings .. xiv

Rode, Commisioner Paul, in attendance at Paris Session .. 2

  election of, in post-war period, as a Commissioner *vice* Commissioner T. Jaczewski (membership vacated) .. 16

  apology received from, at being detained by duties as an Officer of a Section of the Congress .. 2

  death of, prior to circulation of draft Minutes .. xiii

Rosmarus Brünnich, 1771, Secretary to submit Report on .. 313

Rottenburg (von), 1775, *Anmerkungen zu den Hufnagelischen Tabellen der Schmetterlinge* (in Vol. 6 of *Naturforscher*); relative priority to be accorded to, *see* Cramer, 1775 *Uitlandsche Kapellen.*

Royal Society of London, grant by, to assist publication of new edition of the *Règles* .. 78

rufa Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Formica rufa*), placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " .. 410

Russell, Miss Louise, attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission 230, 272, 280, 306, 354

Rusticus Hübner, [1806], an invalid " Tentamen " name, placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 494, 495

Salda Fabricius, 1803, *Cimex littoralis* Linnaeus, 1758, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of .. 468

  placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " .. 469

Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge, terms intermediate between generic and specific trivial names cited on the legends to plates in volume 1 of, not of subgeneric status on that account .. 290

Sand Crab, *Opinion* 13., relating to trivial name of, cancelled .. 578

  procedure to be adopted for determining correct name of, agreed upon .. 579

Page

scalaris Linnaeus, 1768 (as published in the binominal combination *Graptolithus scalaris*) suppressed under the plenary powers for purposes of Article 25 but not for those of Article 35 ; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 377

Schiffermüller & Denis, 1775, *Ankündigung eines systematischen Werkes von den Schmetterlingen der Wiener Gegend* (published anonymously), relative priority to be accorded to, *see* Cramer, 1775, *Uitlandsche Kapellen*.

Schistosoma Weinland, 1858, validation of, under the plenary powers, and position of, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " confirmed 322

Schizaster Agassiz (L.), [1836], *Schizaster studeri* Agassiz (L.), 1840 designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of 527

placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 528

schmidti Rohon, 1892, *Trematapis*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Trematapis* Schmidt, 1866 ; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 435

Schwagerina von Möller, 1877 (type species, by monotypy : *Borealis princeps* Ehrenberg, 1842) ; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 464

sclerites, *see* " organites "

Scopolax Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology ", to be considered 582

secondary homonyms, *see* homonymy

Secretariat of the Commission, Report on, *see* Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature, Section (k)

Secretary to International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature invited to confer with specialists and submit Reports on following matters :—

(*a*) *General questions.*

Article 31, clarification of certain aspects of 502

Classes, Orders and other categories above family level, question of introducing rules for naming of 385–386

emendation of names, question of clarifying Article 19 141

families (including superfamilies), and subfamilies, clarification of rules relating to nomenclature of, and question of introducing rules for naming of tribes 138, 244, 245, 273, 402

neotype, question of recognition of, as a category of type specimen 192–193

stabilisation of nomenclature (with reference, *inter alia*, to proposed recognition in the *Règles* of a Law of Prescription) 232–234

type species of a nominal genus, the name of which was first published in a generic synonymy 351–352

Page

Secretary to I.C.Z.N., etc. (*continued*).

(*b*) *Questions relating to particular cases.*

Acmea Hartmann, 1821 and *Truncatella* Risso, 1826, relative future status of .. 392

Ammonia Brünnich, 1771, status of .. 313

annulatum Dschunkowsky & Luhs, *Piroplasma*, date of publication of .. 433

Brisson, 1762, *Regnum animale* (ed. 2), status of names in .. 313–314

Chinchilla Bennett, 1829, type species of .. 440–441

Colymbus Linnaeus, 1758, type species of .. 362

Dama Zimmermann, 1780, and *Dama virginiana* Zimmermann, 1780, future status to be accorded to .. 551

Echinocrinus Agassiz, 1841, and *Archaeocidaris* M'Coy, 1841, question of proposed suppression of the former name and validation of the latter .. 516

Encrinus Schultze, 1760, arrangements to be made for completion of application relating to, by a specialist in Crinoids .. 513

fasciata Poiret, 1789 (as published in binominal combination *Aplysia fasciata*), future status of .. 304

generic names, of which status discussed in *Opinion* 16 but left undecided, question of addition of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " .. 581–583

Geoffroy, 1762, *Hist. abrég. Ins. Env. Paris*, question of validating certain generic names as published in .. 368

geoffroyi Leach, 1817, *Corixa*, question whether oldest available name for species in question .. 370

Lepidoptera, relative priority to be assigned to certain books and papers published in 1775 containing names of new taxonomic units in .. 459

Limulus Müller, 1785, question of validation of .. 312

Lovenechinus Jackson, 1912, proposed use of plenary powers for .. 513

Manatus Brünnich, 1771, status of .. 313

Naucoris Geoffroy, 1762, question of validation of .. 370

Oken, 1815–1816, *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte*, status of names in, and practice in regard thereto .. 366

Orthoceros Brünnich, 1771, status of .. 313

Petalifera Gray, 1847, and *Aplysiella* Fischer, 1872, future relative status to be accorded to .. 389

Pholidocidaris Meek & Worthen, 1869, proposed use of the plenary powers for .. 513

Pleuronectes Linnaeus, 1758, type species of .. 337

punctata Cuvier, 1803 (as published in the binominal combination *Laplysia* [sic] *punctata*), future status of .. 304

Rosmarus Brünnich, 1771, status of .. 313

Page

Secretary to I.C.Z.N., etc. (*continued*).

(*b*) Questions relating to particular cases (*continued*).

Sand Crab, question of trivial name for, acceptance of which would cause least interference with existing nomenclatorial practice 579

Sparus Linnaeus, 1758, type species of 337

" Tentamen " pamphlet issued by Hübner (J.) in 1806, question of the generic names properly applicable to the species cited therein 496

(*c*) *Administrative tasks to be undertaken by Secretary in relation to decisions taken on earlier occasions*

construction of Schedules to which to be transferred all names on which decisions taken in *Opinions* already rendered 340

insertion of full bibliographical references for all names to be transferred to Schedules prior to such transfer 340–341

submission of Reports on names available under the *Règles* in all cases where, in *Opinions* already rendered, the use of the plenary powers has been refused .. 332

preparation of Reports on all cases where a decision in an *Opinion* deals with part only of problem submitted 355

Secretary-General, Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, vote of thanks by Commission to, for arrangements made for meetings of the Commission 647

Segal, M. J., attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission 272

" select " and " selection ", expressions, in relation to Article 30, to be used in a uniform sense 179

Sepia Schneider, 1784, declared to be a cheironym possessing no status under the *Règles* .. 589

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 590

sepia Schneider, 1784 (as published in the binominal combination *Octopodia sepia*) suppressed under the plenary powers 588

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 590

Sepiola Schneider, 1784, declared to be a cheironym possessing no status under the *Règles* 589

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 590

setosa Leske, 1778 (as published in the binominal combination *Echinometra setosa*), placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 385

sexdecimanae Lewkowicz, 1897 (as published in connection with the generic name *Haemosporidium*) declared to be a technical designation and not a trivial name 617

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 622

Shorey, Miss J. H., in attendance as *Acting Documents Officer* 6, 37, 62, 83, 107, 190, 230, 239, 272

Page

Silvestri, Commissioner Filippo, resignation of, reported 15

Siphonophora Koch, 1855, not invalidated as a generic name by reason of the previous publication of this word as an Ordinal Name (Siphonophora Eschscholtz, 1829) 164

Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., vote of thanks by Commission to, for invitation to Secretary to Commission to visit Washington and other North American centres, for purpose of discussing problems of nomenclature to be considered at Paris Session of Commission 31

Solenius, Lepeletier & Brullé, 1835, application for the designation, under the plenary powers, of *Crabro continuus* Fabricius, [1804–1805], as type species of, deferred for further information to be obtained 415

solium Linnaeus, 1758, *Taenia*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Taenia* Linnaeus, 1758; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 586

sophorae Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio sophorae*) placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 458

Spärck, R., appointment of, as an Alternate Commissioner *vice* Commissioner Th. Mortensen 4

nomination of, to be a Member of the Commission *vice* Commissioner Th. Mortensen (resigned) as from close of Paris Congress and proposed assignment to the Class 1958 19

nomination of, to be a Member of the Commission as from the close of the Paris Congress on abolition of the system of 9-year Classes in the membership of the Commission and consequent reversal of decision to establish a Class 1956 46

request to be excused from acceptance of nomination as a Member of the Commission, in view of pressure of other urgent work, acceptance by Commission of 282

attendance by, at Meetings of the Commission 6, 83, 107, 230, 280, 649

approval by, of Minutes of Paris Meetings xiv

Sparus Linnaeus, 1758, type species of, to be determined as soon as possible and *Opinion* 69 thereupon to be cancelled 337

Spatangus Leske, 1778, suppressed under the plenary powers 526

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 526, 528

Spatangus Modeer, 1793, suppressed under the plenary powers 526

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 526, 528

Spatangus, as used by any other author prior to the publication of *Spatangus* Gray, 1825, suppressed under the plenary powers 526

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 526, 528

Page

Spatangus Gray, 1825, validated under the plenary powers, and *Spatagus purpureus* Müller (O.F.) similarly designated as type species 526, 527

placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 528

specialist groups, development of co-operation by Commission with, during period 1936–48, Report by Secretary on 25–27

" specific name ", expression defined 127

" specific trivial name ", expression introduced and defined 128

Specimen Zoologiae geographicae, Quadripedum Domicilia et Migrationes sistens, 1777, by Zimmermann (A. E. W. von), declared unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes .. 547

Spilothyrus Duponchel, 1835 (type species, by designation under the plenary powers: *Papilio alceae* Esper [1780]) placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 484

stabilisation of zoological nomenclature, means for securing, to be the subject of a Report by the Secretary 231–234

Stejneger, Commissioner Leonhard, death of, reported; adoption by Commission of Resolution of regret at death of 9

Sterna Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered 582

Stiles, Vice-President Charles Wardell, election of, to Class 1946, on expiry of term of service of Class 1937 10

election of, in 1939 to newly-created Office of Vice-President; death of, reported; adoption by Commission of Resolution of regret at death of 9

Stoll, Commissioner Norman R., absence of, from Paris Session 3

election of, in war period as a Commissioner *vice* Vice-President C. W. Stiles (deceased) 16

appointment of, to Class 1955 on expiry of term of service of Class 1946.. 13

Stone, Commissioner Witmer, death of, reported; adoption by Commission of Resolution of regret at death of 9

Straelen, Professor Victor van, appointment of, as an Alternate Commissioner *vice* Commissioner Rudolf Richter 4

attendance by, at Meetings of the Commission 6, 37, 62, 83, 107, 190, 230, 239, 272, 280, 649

nomination of, to be a member of Editorial Committee of three, charged with the duty of supervising the preparation of the text of the *Règles* as revised by the Paris Congress 630

approval by, of Minutes of Paris Meetings xiv

Page

striatus Emmons, 1842 (as published in the binominal combination *Maclurea striatus*) placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 428

strichnocera Fieber, 1844, *Dictyonota*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Dictyonota* Curtis, 1827 ; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 474

Strix Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered 582

Stromateus Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered 582

Strongylocentrotus Brandt, 1835, validated as of subgeneric status as from the date of being so published, under the plenary powers, in so far as necessary, and *Echinus drobachiensis* Müller (O.F.) 1776 designated under the plenary powers as type species ; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 521

struthoides Owen, 1844 (as published in the binominal combination *Dinornis struthoides*) placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology ".. 450

studeri Agassiz (L.), 1840, *Schizaster*, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Schizaster* Agassiz (L.) [1836] 527

placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 528

Subfamilies, rules for governing nomenclature of, to be examined by Secretary in Report on rules for family names 138

subgeneric names in relation to specific homonymy, *see Règles*, etc., Article 2.

Sub-Orders, rules governing nomenclature of, question of introducing into the *Règles*, to be examined by the Secretary 385–386

" subspecific name ", expression defined 127

" subspecific trivial name ", expression introduced and defined 128–129

Superfamilies, rules for governing nomenclature of, to be examined by Secretary in Report on rules for family names 138

" syntype ", expression to be introduced and defined 185–186

Systematisch-alphabetisches Verzeichniss of Hübner (J.), terms intermediate between generic and specific trivial names cited in, not of subgeneric status on that account .. 290

Tachys Stephens, 1828, application for the designation, under the plenary powers, of *Tachys scutellaris* Stephens, 1828, as type species of, deferred for further information to be obtained 447,448

Page

Taenia Linnaeus, 1758, *Taenia solium* Linnaeus, 1758, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of; validation of erroneous entry in " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " (*Opinion* 92) 586

Tapirus, generic name, first published in Brünnich, 1771, *Zoologiae Fundamenta*, if Brisson, 1762, *Regnum animale* (ed. 2) found to be not available 314

tardus Herbst, 1779 (as published in the binominal combination *Dytiscus tardus*); placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology ".. 461

tectus Boieldieu, 1856 (as published in the binominal combination *Ptinus tectus*) question of species to which applicable to be considered 501

Teleosteus Volger, 1860, suppressed under the plenary powers; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology ".. 430

" *Tentamen* ", *see* Hübner (J.).

terrestris Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Apis terrestris*); placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 407

tertiana Labbé, 1894 (as published as a subspecific trivial name in the trinominal combination *Haemamoeba laverani* var. *tertiana*) a subjective junior synonym of *Haemamoeba vivax* Grassi & Feletti, 1890 618

tertianae Celli & Sanfelice, 1891 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*) declared to be a technical designation and not a trivial name .. 617

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 623

tertianae Kruse, 1892 (as published in connection with the binominal combination *Plasmodium malariae*) declared to be a technical designation and not a trivial name .. 617

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 623

tertianae Lewkowicz, 1897 (as published in connection with the generic name *Haemosporidium*) declared to be a technical designation and not a trivial name 617

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 623

Tethys, as a generic name published by any author subsequent to Linnaeus, 1758, and prior to Linnaeus, 1767, suppression of, under the plenary powers 302

Tethys Linnaeus, 1758, suppression of, under the plenary powers 302

Tethys Linnaeus, 1767, validated under the plenary powers and *Tethys fimbria* Linnaeus, 1767, similarly designated as its type species 303

placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 303

Tetyra Fabricius, 1803, *Cimex antillarum* Kirkaldy, 1909, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 474

Page

Tetrao Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered .. 582

Teuthis Schneider, 1784, declared to be a cheironym possessing no status under the *Règles* .. 589

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 590

teuthis Schneider, 1784 (as published in the binominal combination *Octopodia teuthis*) suppressed under the plenary powers .. 588

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " .. 590

thalia Linnaeus, 1758, *Papilio* designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Actinote* Hübner [1819] .. 394

placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " .. 395

Thymele Fabricius, 1807 (type species, by selection by Westwood, 1840 : *Papilio tages* Linnaeus, 1758 ; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 458

Thymele [Illiger], 1807, suppressed under the plenary powers ; placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " .. 456

Tomoceras Nicolet, 1842, *Macrotoma minor* Lubbock, 1862, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of .. 506

placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " .. 507

Tonna Brünnich, 1771 (type species, by selection by Suter, 1913 : *Buccinum galea* Linnaeus, 1758), placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " .. 310

Trechus Schellenberg, 1806, application for the designation, under the plenary powers, of *Carabus quadristriatus* Schrank, 1781, as type species of, deferred for further information to be obtained .. 447,448

Tractatus physicus de petrificatis, 1758, *see* Gesner (J.).

Tremataspis Schmidt, 1866, *Tremataspis schmidti* Rohan, 1892, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of ; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " .. 435

Trewavas, Dr. Ethelwynn, attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission .. 306,354

Tribes, rules for governing naming of, to be examined by Secretary in Report on rules for family names .. 138

Tringa Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered .. 582

ristis Van der Linden, 1829, *Pemphridon*, *see Diodontus* Curtis, 1834.

Page

trivial names, capital initial letters not to be used for, *see Règles*, etc., Article 13.

trivial names consisting of adjectives, method to be used for determining correct termination to be used according to the gender of the generic name with which it is in agreement 248–249

trivial names differing from one another solely by reason of fact that second portion of name consists, in the one case of a word in noun form and, in the other, of the same word in adjectival form, no need to make special provision for, under the Law of Homonymy, having regard to decision that list of differences in spelling now to be inserted therein to be an exhaustive list 242

trivial names, establishment of Official List for, *see* " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology ".

" True Chinchilla " of Chile (*Chinchilla velligera* Prell, 1934) *see Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829.

tropica Koch, 1899, *Plasmodium*, declared to be a cheironym 618

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 623

type species of a genus, term to be used for, *see Règles*, Article 30, general provisions.

type specimens, terminology to be applied to 184–188

type specimen of a species or subspecies, criteria to be adopted in determining identity of, *see Règles*, etc., Article 31 .. ..

uddeni Beede & Kniker, 1924 (as published in the binominal combination *Schwagerina uddeni*) placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 464

undecimanae Lewkowicz, 1897 (as published in connection with the generic name *Haemosporidium*) declared to be a technical designation and not a trivial name.. 617

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 623

U.N.E.S.C.O., vote of thanks to, by the Commission for grant of financial assistance .. 32

funds provided by, available to assist publication of the revised text of the *Règles* .. 78

unicolor Leske, 1778, *Spatangus brissus* var., designated under the plenary pwers to be the type species of *Brissus* Gray, 1825 527

placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 529

Upupa Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered 582

Page

Urania Fabricius, 1807, validated under the plenary powers 456

placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology (type species selected by Latreille, 1810 : *Papilio leilus* Linnaeus) 457

oldest available name for type species of, to be placed on " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " when determined 459

Urania [Illiger], 1807, suppressed under the plenary powers : placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 456

Urbanus Hübner, [1806], an invalid " Tentamen " name, placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " 494, 495

Usinger, Professor Robert L., appointment of, as an Alternate Commissioner *vice* Commissioner Harold E. Vokes 4

attendance by, at Meetings of the Commission 6, 37, 62, 83, 107, 190, 230, 239, 272, 280, 306, 354, 425, 649

nomination of, to be a member of the Editorial Committee of three charged with the duty of supervising the preparation of the text of the *Règles* as revised by the Paris Congress 630

approval by, of Minutes of Paris Meetings xiv

" valid name," expression defined (*see* also " available name ") 336

Valle, Signor Antonio, attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission 280

varieties (below subspecific level), introduction of rules governing naming of, *see Règles*, etc., New Article (1) .. ..

velligera Prell, 1934, *Chinchilla*, *see Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829

Venus Linnaeus, 1758, *Venus verrucosa* Linnaeus, 1758, designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of ; placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " 304

verrucosa Linnaeus, 1758, *Venus*, designated under plenary powers to be the type species of *Venus* Linnaeus, 1758 304

placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names on Zoology " 305

vigesimotertianae Lewkowicz, 1897 (as published in connection with the generic name *Haemosporidium*) declared to be a technical designation and not a trivial name.. .. 617

placed on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 623

Page

virginiana Zimmermann, 1780 (as published in the binominal combination *Dama virginiana*) available under the *Règles*: question of future status of, to be examined by Secretary, in consultation with interested specialists 551

vivax Grassi & Feletti, 1890 (as published in the binominal combination *Haemamoeba vivax*) declared to be the oldest available name for the Benign Tertian Malaria Parasite 618

placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 620

Vokes, Commissioner Harold E., absence of, from Paris Session 3

election of, in war period, as a Commissioner *vice* Commissioner L. Stejneger (deceased) 16

vomitoria Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Musca vomitoria*) placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 356

vulgaris Cuvier, [1797] (as published in the binominal combination *Octopus vulgaris*) placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 590

vulgare Sandberger, 1889 (as published in the binominal combination *Rhipidophyllum vulgare*) validated under the plenary powers; placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 430

vulgaris Schmeil, 1897 (as published in the binominal combination *Diaptomus vulgaris*) validated under the plenary powers: 376

placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " 377

Vultur Linnaeus, 1758, question of admission of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be considered 582

Wenyon, C. M., thanked by the Commission for assistance given in searching the literature to determine the first publication of the name *Piroplasma annulatum* commonly attributed to Dschankowsky & Luhs 433

Winckworth, Mr. R., attendance by, at public meetings of the Commission 6, 62, 280, 306

Xiphosura Brünnich, 1771, Secretary to submit Report on, with reference to *Limulus* Müller, 1785 311–312

Page

Zimmermann (A. E. W. von), *Specimen Zoologiae*, 1777, declared unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes 547

Geographische Geschichte, 1778–1783, declared available for nomenclatorial purposes .. 548

" Zoological Record," *see* literature-recording serials.

Zoographia rosso-asiatica of Pallas (P.S.), dates of publication of the several volumes determined 403

Zoophylacium Gronovianum of Gronovius [1763–1781], Meuschen's index to, declared to be unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes 504

Z.N.(S.) Files, applications contained in, to be examined in turn 475

decisions taken on applications contained in, to be reported to section on Nomenclature 559

Particulars of dates of publication of the several Parts in which the present Volume was published

Part No.	*Contents of Part*	*Date of Publication*
1/3	T.P.—1, 1—62	21st April 1950
4/6	63—158	25th May 1950
7/9	159—254	25th May 1950
10/12	255—350	9th June 1950
13/15	351—446	9th June 1950
16/18	447—542	9th June 1950
19/21	543—652	9th June 1950
22/24	653—760	

PURCHASED
24 NOV 1950

BULLETIN OF
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE
VOLUME 4—PARTS 22/24

On last page 760 bottom right hand corner, date of publication should read:

29th November, 1950.

THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, have great pleasure in expressing their grateful thanks to the UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION (U.N.E.S.C.O.) for the financial assistance afforded towards the cost of producing the present volume.

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Notice to subscribers regarding the arrangements made for the completion of volume 1 and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5

The following arrangements have been made for completing volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5 :—

Volume 1 : A concluding Part (Part 12), containing, *inter alia*, the Title Page, Table of Contents, and alphabetical subject index, will be published shortly.

Volume 2 : This volume, like Volume 1, will be devoted to the publication of applications in regard to nomenclatorial problems submitted by specialists to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. Publication will commence at an early date.

Volume 3 : This volume, which is now complete in 9 Parts, is devoted to the publication of the memoranda, reports and other documents considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at their meetings held in Paris in July 1948.

Volume 4 : This volume, which is now complete in 24 Parts, is devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July* 1948.

Volume 5 : At the request of the Bureau of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, this volume has been devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July* 1948, together with the Reports submitted to the Congress by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature. Parts 1–6 have already been published. The remaining Parts will be published at an early date.

INQUIRIES

All inquiries regarding publications should be addressed to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, and all inquiries regarding the scientific work of the Commission to the Secretary to the Commission at the following addresses :—

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7, England.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : Secretariat of the Commission, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.

Printed in Great Britain by Metchim and Son, Ltd., Westminster, London

9^{50} 12/

4/84